

JAN 28 1959

Presented to
**United
Theological Seminary
Library**

Dayton, Ohio



by

L.G. Battelle

CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM




THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO • DALLAS
ATLANTA • SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

BY
WILLIAM PIERSON MERRILL



New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1919


All rights reserved



COPYRIGHT, 1918

By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published December, 1918.



TO
MR. AND MRS. ANDREW CARNEGIE
PIONEERS IN THE CAUSE OF TRUE INTERNATIONALISM,
AND LOYAL TO IT THROUGH ALL CHANGING
WORLD-CONDITIONS.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I THE FUNCTION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE WORLD	I
II THE OLD TESTAMENT AND INTERNATIONALISM	17
III THE NEW TESTAMENT AND INTERNATIONALISM	34
IV CHRISTIANITY AND INTERNATIONALISM	51
V DEMOCRACY AND INTERNATIONALISM	68
VI AMERICA AND INTERNATIONALISM	81
VII CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS FOR AN INTERNATIONAL ORDER	95
VIII PROBLEMS CONFRONTING INTERNATIONALISM	113
IX CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING INTERNATIONALISM	131
X THE WAR AND INTERNATIONALISM	144
XI THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONALISM	160
XII CONCLUSIONS	174

CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

CHAPTER I

THE FUNCTION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE WORLD

CHRISTIAN Internationalism! Is there such a thing? Can there be such a thing? Can there be Christian nations, living together like Christian gentlemen?

If not, we may as well stop talking about "Christian Civilization." We have well nigh stopped talking of it, those of us who are sensitive to the real values and high meanings that lie locked within that great word "Christian."

One of the most tragic facts about the war is that it has gone on in Christendom. There is a sarcasm that bites and stings in the cartoon which represents a party of Africans looking on at the scenes of fury and bloodshed in Europe, and asking, "Why do the Christians rage?" The picture in the second Psalm is reversed. It is the "people of God" who are raging, and the "heathen" laugh and have them in derision.

2 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

How can such things be, when Christ has been in the world these two thousand years?

We cannot lay the whole blame on any one man, or even on any one living nation. Germany planned and made the war. History will pronounce that verdict. Had it still been in doubt, Prince Lichnowsky's revelations have removed the last shred of possibility of doubt. Harden's proud "We willed it" will some day be the sad confession of shame made by a Germany at last seeing herself as others see her, and as she is.

Yet it is clear that the blame does not rest on Germany alone, certainly not alone on the Germany of to-day. We can trace the war back to remote causes. Perhaps heavier blame rests on the Germany of 1871, and the Germany of 1866, and the Germany of Frederick the Great. So many times Germans had learned the lesson that the way of the transgressor may be very profitable!

We cannot lay the blame for this tragic catastrophe, in any degree, upon a hidden, mysterious fate. Wise words of warning have been spoken lately:

"Again the venerable refrain is heard: 'The fatality of war is stronger than our wills.' The old refrain of the herd that makes a god of its weakness, and bows down before him. Man has

invented fate, that he may make it responsible for the disorders of the universe, those disorders which it was his duty to regulate. There is no fatality! The only fatality is what we desire, and, more often, too, what we do not desire enough. Let each now repeat his *mea culpa*. The leaders of thought, the church, the Labor Parties did not desire war. That may be. What then did they do to prevent it? "

No matter how clearly it may come to be seen and acknowledged by all the world, Germany included, that the war came because Germany would have it, Christendom as a whole must bear a heavy burden of shame and guilt, that such a hideous thing could come out of her twenty centuries of knowing Jesus Christ. Such things ought not to be; they would not be if Christianity had laid hold firmly on the relations between nations, and controlled the spirit and conduct of states. If such things are not to be in the future, it must be by a Christian control of international life, that is by an outworking of Christian Internationalism.

The question whether there can be Christian Internationalism rests back on the question, What is the true function and mission of Christianity in the world?

A helpful discussion of this fundamental ques-

4 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

tion is found in Professor Peabody's "The Christian Life in the Modern World." Its usefulness is lessened by the fact that, written before the war, it is necessarily somewhat out of touch with the radically changed and rapidly changing conditions of our time. But it still has value, for it deals with basic issues.

All through the ages there has gone on a conflict between two conceptions of the place of Christianity in the world. We may call them the indigenous and the exotic views; the one holds that Christianity has a natural place and function in the world; the other that it is here under protest, in the interests of another world, a thing apart from the normal interests of social life and development.

A certain amount of truth underlies the conviction that the Christian is to be something more than a citizen of his world and of his time, that he is really a citizen of another world, or another age. But the vital truth is not that he is a citizen of another realm, living here altogether as a pilgrim and a foreigner. The truth is that the Christian is a citizen of the world that ought to be and that some day shall be, through the good grace of God. He lives on the front line, and is supremely interested in what lies ahead.

When settlers come into a strange country

where customs and standards are different from those by which they have lived in the home land, lower than those they have known, three courses are open to them. They can abandon their inherited standards and ideals, and lapse into the lower life about them, as educated Indians have, sometimes, "gone back to the blanket." They can stand stiffly by their cherished customs and familiar standards, like the Englishman of whom Price Collier tells, who, living in a remote village of India, where no other white man ever came, put on evening dress for dinner every night. Or they can hold steadfastly to their great principles and ideals, while yet adjusting themselves and their conduct, at every possible point, to the life about them, and so lift up that life to their own high plane. So are Christians in the world. Some of them are frankly and wholly worldly, content with things as they are. Some are otherworldly, out of touch with the things of earth through holding their thoughts and fixing their hopes on the hereafter. But the best Christian, the real and wholesome Christian, mingles with life as Jesus did, above it in holiness, yet a part of it in wholesomeness, feeling it his mission and the mission of the Christ he serves to lift the world to a better and higher life.

As Professor Peabody so well points out, there

6 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

are two sets of extremists who hold that Christianity and the modern world are irreconcilable.

On the one hand we find those who glory in the modern world, in its thoughts and ideals, its progress and splendor, and condemn Christianity as outworn, hopelessly out of touch with modernity, or even a weakening and retarding influence which must be cast away if man is to make the progress he might and should.

The High Priest of this party which clings to the modern world and rejects Christianity is Nietzsche, with his scorn for Jesus, his hatred of Paul, his glorification of ruthless power, his beatitudes of hatred and force, his ideal of the superman. He has a host of followers, few of them going so far as their leader went, but many of them holding the insidious and dangerous doctrine frankly avowed by General Bernhardi, that the standards of Christ are authoritative for the individual life, but cannot hold for the conduct of great groups of men, and least of all for nations in their conduct and relations.

At the other extreme we find ascetics, rebels against the established order, men wholly out of touch with the world. Tolstoi is the most conspicuous example of this group. Like the first group, these men hold that Christianity and modern life are incompatible; but, unlike the other

group, they abandon not Christianity, but modern life. They flee from it, to save their souls. They "leave the poor old stranded wreck" of a world, and "pull for the shore" of some little island, where they can live as spiritual Robinson Crusoes. Such are legitimate successors of the great monks and mystics who, in earlier times, sang "*de contemptu mundi*."

To this group belong those extreme pre-millennarians, who form an interesting, rather pitiful, somewhat dangerous, element in the religious life of our day. In their view the world as a whole is all wrong, hopelessly wrong. They have no use for a "social gospel"; they distrust efforts to put the power of the Christian Church into movements designed to make a better and happier world; they scorn such efforts as "mere humanitarianism." The world, as they see it, is going to the devil, where it belongs; and nothing can save it but a catastrophe, a miraculous intervention; and that, in reality, will not save the world so much as substitute for it another world.

It may seem strange to group together Nietzsche and Tolstoi, the formalist and the fanatic. Yet they are in complete agreement in their conviction that Christianity and the modern world are hopelessly incompatible; that no one can hold to both; that Christian principles and ideals have no

8 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

vital connection with the world's practical life. One says, "Christianity and the world are incompatible; therefore I give up Christianity." The other says, "Christianity and the world are incompatible; therefore I give up the world." But they agree in leaving the world untouched by the power of Christianity.

Between these two extremes stands the real Christian, the wholesome Christian, who lives by the faith that Christianity is in the world to save the world, not merely the individual in the world. Christianity is a power manifested in human society for its redemption and transformation. The Christian "way" is not most of all a way to heaven, but far more a way to fair and happy living for all men here. Their Christ is One Who came to be King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; such a Christ must be tremendously interested in political and social evolution. Christianity will never have come to its fruition until we do in fact what we are always singing, "Bring forth the royal diadem and crown Him Lord of all"; and that not in some distant heavenly realm, but here on earth.

How splendid is the picture presented of the goal of Christianity in the opening chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians! How tawdry by comparison are the cheap stage settings, the canvas

and paint imitations of a real triumph, set before us in the spectacular pictures of pre-millenarianism! Paul's later thought is incomparably richer and more real than that which we find in his earliest letters, those to the Thessalonians. Here in the chapters referred to, we see as God's purpose, in creation, in evolution, in redemption, "to sum up all things in Christ." The world, "all things," is to be brought "into subjection under the feet of Christ"; and the church is Christ's body, His instrument, here in the world to work out the will of Christ in the world. Christ's aim is to bring peace on earth, through "breaking down middle walls of partition," and making of different races and creeds and groups "one new man, so making peace."

It is a defective and unsound Christianity which is overmuch exercised about heaven, or the second coming of the Lord, or any other unearthly aspects of religion. The true Christian sees God here and now, "every common bush afire with God." He cries with the clear-visioned Psalmist, "the heavens are thine; the earth also is thine"; "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein." The true Christian sees himself not as one set apart and waiting for some future divine use; but as one apprenticed to God in His present work-shop, where

his motto may be; "my Father worketh even until now, and I work." The church, in his view, is not an ark, or a life-boat, in which one here and another there are saved; it is a movement, a brotherhood, to save the corporate life of humanity. Salvation becomes to him not a purely personal and individual affair, but a common racial and social experience or aspiration. God works with man even more than with men. The best mark of a "saved" man is not that he wants to go to heaven, but that he is willing to go to China, or to the battle-field in France, or to the slum of the city, or to the last dollar of his resources, or to the limit of his energy, to set forward the Kingdom of God, with a great faith in his heart that Christ in him can make a difference that will last, here on the earth. Real Christianity is not like those richly illustrated lectures on Colorado or California, skillfully designed to make people want to go to that distant place and live there; it is rather like a talk on community welfare, arousing those who hear it to a new enthusiasm for making their own neighborhood a better, healthier, happier place.

If one holds the "otherworldly" view of the nature and function of Christianity, then there is no place in his scheme of things for Christian Internationalism. He may hope that the relations between nations might be somewhat improved by

the presence of Christian individuals in places of influence and authority, but he cannot hope for the dominance of Christianity in world-affairs, until the end of the world comes, and God sets up a new world which shall stand forever as a confession that He met defeat in this present world.

But if one takes the wholesome view, then he will confidently expect Christianity to manifest its power supremely in the control of international relations. For he sees that Christ came, and still comes, to make different not only individuals, but homes, and schools, and neighborhoods, and cities, and commerce, and politics; and the very climax of that process whereby Christianity climbs to the seat of authority is in the dominance of international life and relations by Christian principles and the Christian spirit. That is the hardest, the noblest, task of all for Christianity to achieve.

Christianity has proved its power in the home; there are Christian homes, many of them. It has shown its power in communities. No community ever had a hospital before Christ touched it. There are such things as Christian cities. But the mighty realm of diplomacy, of international relations, has scarce been touched by Christianity as yet. It stands the greatest and most stubborn of all heathen provinces.

The true Christian believes that there is "no

other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved." And he believes that is true of nations, as well as of individuals. He sees Christian Internationalism not only as a clear possibility, a desirable achievement, but as the very capstone of the social structure of the Kingdom of God. All other out-workings and demonstrations of Christianity must be imperfect and defective until Christ is enthroned there at the top. A man is not wholly saved, his redemption lacks something, if his home is not Christian through and through; a home cannot be wholly Christian until the city in which it is located is under the power of Christian ideals; a city is hampered in its outliving of Christian ideals if it is part of a nation dominated by unchristian principles; and a nation can never be fully and really Christian until Christianity rules the inter-related life of the nations.

Can any one doubt or question this influence of the larger environment, in this day? Here are thousands of Christian young men; each of them knows God has said, "Thou shalt not kill." He does not want to kill; he hates the idea of murder. He has no hatred for other men. But he must march forth to kill other men; he must be trained to kill them expertly and expeditiously. And the fault lies not in any defect in his individual Chris-

tian life or ideals, but in the simple fact that international relations have never become a part of the Kingdom of God, and back from that unregenerated part of the common life of man reach influences which make it necessary for that Christian man to do what his conscience condemns as essentially unchristian acts. The man cannot be wholly Christian until the world in which he lives is subject to the rule of Christ.

The holiest, the most exciting, the most adventurous, the most truly Christian cause is this of Christianizing international relations. All else waits upon the success of that.

It may be wise to say a word as to the meaning of the word "Internationalism." There is, in some quarters, grave distrust of the word and the idea back of it, a fear that the development of internationalism would mean the decline of patriotism, a distrust accentuated by the Russian situation. Was it not internationalism, men ask, which dissolved Russia and left it helpless in the hands of Germany? Was it not internationalism which worked so insidiously and so disastrously in the Italian army? Is it not a dangerous word and a dangerous propaganda?

No! It was not internationalism that brought Russia to her present impotence; it was un-nationalism. Internationalism, as I am using the term,

as I believe it should be used, does not mean a sort of free love toward nations, a promiscuity of relationship in which all the sacredness of patriotism is lost. Those are quite right who tell us that it is just as immoral to say "I love every other country as well as my own" as to say, "I love every other woman as well as my wife." God has set us in families and in nations, and we realize our best possibilities in loyal allegiance to those relationships. There is still a place, and always will be, in the heart of the Christian man for that intense devotion to one's own nation that leads to the solemn declaration, "If I forget thee, may my hand forget its cunning."

But the sort of patriotism which stops at the border, the sort of patriotism which involves hatred and suspicion toward other nations, is defective and unworthy. Am I worse as a father for being a loyal citizen? Am I weaker in civic loyalty for being devoted to the nation? Why then should it be assumed that I shall be a weaker patriot for being a thorough-going internationalist? Is it not reasonable to go on with the process until the highest loyalty to the widest fellowship of all takes supreme place among my interests?

If I am a true patriot, I will want my nation to have its rights in its dealings with other nations; but, if I am a true patriot, I will even more desire

that my nation prove true to its duties and fulfill its rightful obligations, in the general society of the nations. Just as my love for my home makes me the more eager for a national life worthy of that home, so my love of country should make me more eager for an international life and order in which a nation can safely play the part of a Christian nation.

Christianity is here in the world not as an interruption, or an irruption, that it may pull a few out from a general wreck and take them to some better place. Christianity is here on a mission, to transform "this present evil world" into the world God means to have here, the world that shall be a home for God and His children, a society of men and women and children, organized into national groups, but growing into a world-wide fellowship of knowledge, love, and achievement, under the leadership of Jesus Christ.

An army, pushing its victorious advance, finds one stubborn stronghold which resists; and it realizes that it must capture that one center of resistance, or its advance is imperilled. So Christianity, advancing to the control of the world's life, halts before this great citadel of International Relationships, where pagan forces are still strongly intrenched; and it realizes that the whole program and hope of Christian redemption is held back,

thwarted, imperilled, until that fortress is reduced. The social life of nations must be brought into obedience to Christ. The principles and ideals of Christianity must be worked out for great groups of people, and set in control of their common thought and conduct. Only so can the creation, "groaning and travailing in pain together even until now, be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God."

CHAPTER II

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND INTERNATIONALISM

CHRISTIANS base their faith upon the Bible. They profess to regard it as the rule of their faith and conduct. It becomes then a matter of real importance that any movement or cause claiming the interest and support of Christian people should be able to justify itself on scriptural grounds, or at least to show that it is in general harmony with the teachings of the Bible rather than antagonistic to them.

What is the attitude of the Old Testament toward internationalism? One might be a reasonably careful reader of the Old Testament books, or even a student of them, and come upon little or nothing on which to base the theory or practice of godly internationalism.

There have been few books so openly and intensely nationalistic as the Old Testament writings. There have been few races so vividly conscious of being different from other people, having a holy mission, few people so certain that the purposes of God were wrapped up in them, as the ancient He-

brews were. In fact the remark has been common of late that the God of Germany is in reality the Jehovah of the Old Testament, the God of a chosen people, Who sends out His people with a passion and a program and a sword, to make the world serve that one chosen nation. There has been a distinct reaction against the Old Testament, on the ground that there is so much in it which seems to harmonize with that intensely nationalistic temper of which Germany is the chief exponent. Irving Bacheller, in his little book, "Keeping up with William," says that it is time the Old Testament was "divested of its odor of sanctity," for much of it "reads like a report of the German General Staff."

There is much to warrant the impression that internationalism finds little recognition in the Old Testament. We see God choosing one man, and then the descendants of that one man, as His peculiar people. He gives His law to them; He makes His revelations through them; He protects and guides them; He sends them to dispossess and kill off and subjugate other races. Their heroes are intense nationalists,—Moses, abandoning Egypt, demanding the right of way through territories belonging to other races, leading a war of extermination against the Amalekites because of some ancient injury Israel had suffered at their

hands; Joshua, refusing to make any covenant or agreement with the people of Canaan, killing men, women, children, and cattle when a town was captured; David, setting Israel high above the surrounding nations; Ezra and Nehemiah, with their strict prohibition of inter-marriage, and their rigid refusal to come to any friendly relations with the Samaritans; the Maccabees, nationalists to the last degree. It might well seem that the first thing for the internationalist to do, if he would have a Bible that would sanction his aims and hopes, would be to throw out from his Bible the entire Old Testament.

But closer and deeper study reveals certain facts, in the light of which our estimate must be revised. Here are certain conclusions which become clear to the honest and thoughtful student:

First, we must admit the presence, in the Old Testament, of an outgrown element of aggressive nationalism, and must beware of counting it still authoritative or admirable.

Christ did come to fulfill the law, to do away with much of the old thought and practice of the people of God. The Old Testament is rightly bound in with the New as one volume of the Word of God; our Bible would be seriously impaired were the Old Testament to be dropped from it; for it shows the growth of our faith. Christianity

cannot be rightly seen in a static condition. It must be seen living, growing, changing, to be seen at all as it is. Growth and change are essential to it. Christianity cannot be set forth in a set of slides, each complete in itself. It must be seen as a moving picture, where one scene melts into another, and the true impression comes from the movement of the whole, rather than from the separate parts. The Bible is the record of how Christianity came to be what it is.

That necessarily involves the inclusion, in the earlier portions of the Bible, of much which now is obsolete, and which we must frankly admit to be outworn or outgrown. We may then, and we should, accept the fact of the presence, here and there through the Old Testament, of a bitter, sectional, nationalistic tone,—the temper we associate with the word “jingo.” The Book of Esther glories in the exaltation of the Jew, in the misfortunes that come upon his enemies, in the glory of his victory over them. Luther heartily disliked Esther, calling it a “heathen” book. Ezra and Nehemiah set forth a policy of race exclusiveness, which makes it clear to us that the feud between the Jews and the Samaritans was not all the fault of the Samaritans. Certain of the Psalms and of the prophecies reflect this temper, with their intensely nationalistic spirit, their glorification of the

Hebrew race. We are shown, as the ideal ruler, one who shall rule the other nations with a rod of iron, and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." The Messiah, riding forth at the head of his troops, will smite the foe so vehemently that the ravines will be filled with corpses.

The plain, crude, original meaning of many of these Old Testament passages has been softened and obscured by a process of spiritualization, a re-interpretation in the light of Christian thoughts and emotions. We read the 63rd chapter of Isaiah, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah," and we see Jesus Christ, Savior of the world, "marching in the greatness of his strength," "treading the wine-press alone," "bringing salvation." The blood we see is His own blood, shed to redeem men. We need not quarrel with those who can thus take that passage. But it is beyond all question that no such vision was in the mind of the original writer. He saw a conqueror, a War-Lord, returning from a bloody campaign against Edom, the enemy of Israel; He has trampled the people in his fury, and it is their blood that is sprinkled on his garments. It is a cry of satisfied vengeance, of exultation almost savage over punishment meted out to men of another, an alien, race.

In our attitude toward the presence of such

passages in the Bible, we are helped very greatly by the newer light on the Bible and on the doctrine of its inspiration. A half century ago or less many were seriously troubled over the divine approval of the slaughter of the Canaanites, and the unchristian spirit of certain Psalms. I remember the way in which my boyish protests were met, with reference to the slaughter of the Canaanites. I was told that the Canaanites were the worst of all people, brutal and beastly folk, who had to be exterminated as a jungle full of wild beasts might be. But better acquaintance with the facts showed me, later, that there was no foundation for the claim that the Canaanites were the wickedest of all men. The argument ran merrily 'round in a circle, as many another has done: The Israelites killed the Canaanites because they were so wicked. How do we know they were so wicked? Why, they must have been, or God's people wouldn't have killed them. It is a characteristic bit of squirrel-cage theology.

The sane, true explanation is in terms of growth. These parts of the Old Testament are valuable still as showing us that out of which we have grown, the crude, early stages of that development of the knowledge and service of God which comes to us purified by the handling of Jesus Christ. They are in the Bible as warnings to us,

not as examples, not as justification for a similar spirit on our part. He who uses the nationalistic temper of the Old Testament to justify a narrow jingo spirit to-day shows that he has not grasped the very heart-significance of the Bible as a revelation of God and of religion; for that heart-significance lies in growth, movement, religious development which is ever leaving "its low-vaulted past."

The Word of God is our light. All along the coast line of our country are light-houses. Many of them are set to indicate where safe harbors lie. They say to the mariner, "Come; here is safety." But many more of them are set to warn the mariner away from dangers. They say, "Beware; come not here; a ship was wrecked here." Who would say that the lights that warn are not as useful as the lights that beckon? Much that we find in the Old Testament the Spirit of God has set there for warning, to show us where the people of God made false steps, thought wrong thoughts, followed wrong lines that led to disaster. And the Bible is never more truly a "light to our way" than when it thus shows us the mistakes of the people of God, that we may not fall into the same errors.

This then is the first fact to remember in estimating the relation between the Old Testament and internationalism,—that much of the Bible is

24 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

outgrown, to be frankly set aside as possessing no authority over us to-day.

The second great fact to be kept in mind is the fact that these very parts of the Old Testament, and this entire policy of exclusiveness and narrow nationalism, were necessary at the time that men might be carried on through them into broader and more generous views and practices.

So far as we can see, it was necessary that God, in leading men on to the full truth, should set apart one people, and train them, with an exclusiveness almost rigid, in order to the ultimate good and blessedness of mankind. This is not to justify all their exclusiveness and narrowness. When God allows an inch, men take a yard, particularly when it is in the direction of their natural instincts.

But that method of restricted, intensive cultivation is the method of nature, and that means that it is the method of God. When Luther Burbank undertakes to produce a plant of a certain variety superior to any now to be found, his ultimate hope and aim is to have that plant cultivated everywhere, proving a blessing to all men. But he begins by carefully isolating certain plants for experimentation; he guards them jealously from influences surrounding them, until he has produced the superior plant.

There never was a religious leader so concerned

for all humanity, so free from racial or class particularity, as Jesus. Yet Jesus deliberately chose twelve men and gave the major part of His attention to them. His aim was the reaching of all men; but His method was the method of restricted and intensive cultivation.

An example from political evolution is right at hand. America began as an experiment in democracy. Our first President warned us, in a phrase still harped upon, to beware of "entangling alliances." It was wise and necessary advice. Until we had established our government, confirmed our strength, tested our principles, achieved a real and thorough unity — and we had to fight a great war before all that was won — it was the part of wisdom to avoid entanglements, to pursue a policy of comparative isolation. But now we are beginning to lift our eyes to a wider horizon, to see that "what God has given us, He has given us for all mankind," to see, as President Wilson so forcibly said in his address at Mount Vernon on July 4th last, that Washington and his fellows were doing something of vital concern to all the world of mankind, and not for one people only.

So in the outworking of the true religion, that restriction which marked the earlier stages was in order to future growth, to universal blessing. We can see that it may have been necessary, perhaps it

was the only way, to keep the people aloof, to guard them jealously from inter-mixture of race or of thought, to cultivate in them an intense nationalism. We may well remind ourselves also that "internationalism," in the modern sense of that word, was outside the range of the mind of Old Testament times. The only world-unity men then saw as possible was an imperial unity, in which one power should dominate the whole world. There was little in such a vision to arouse the enthusiasm of believers in God and in justice and freedom.

We can clearly see then that the intense nationalism of the Old Testament was in part due to the crude, defective, primitive stage of thought and feeling at which the people of God stood; and in part also may be justified as necessary in the progress of mankind toward larger views and more humane and brotherly practices.

A third fact we should keep in mind is the presence in the Old Testament of a surprisingly large amount of material which counteracts and protests against the narrow and exclusive nationalism which some thoughtlessly take as characteristic of the entire Old Testament.

In the original word to Abraham, calling him to be the chosen man of God, it is distinctly stated, "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be

blessed." Very often we come upon a realization, clear or vague, that the real end of Israel's exclusiveness is universal brotherhood.

We do find Ezra and Nehemiah holding up as worthy of the approval of God and of all right men their rigid policy of non-intercourse between Israel and other peoples. But we find also a book, coming probably from that very period, which quietly but effectively puts forth the other side,—all the more effectively for setting it in story-form. The book of Ruth takes a Moabitess as its heroine, and makes her shine forth as one of the great and true women of God, a better wife, a better daughter, than her Hebrew contemporaries. What an effective thrust at the narrow policy of isolation, to show that David, hero of the Jewish heart, was the fruit of a mixed marriage! It is a marvel to find in the Old Testament so liberal a book, one with so broad and generous a view. It shows us the Spirit of the God of Brotherhood at work in the midst of the spirit of exclusiveness and race prejudice.

The book of Esther does exhibit a spirit of intense nationalism which is quite unchristian. But over against it we may set another Old Testament writing,—the book of Jonah,—like Ruth the more effective for being in story form. We see the Hebrew prophet contrasted unfavorably with

the heathen seamen, their simple piety more true than his, for all his superior enlightenment. We see the people of Nineveh,—that hated, heathen city, ready to repent, and, through their penitence, winning favor from God. (How quick was our Lord to see and set forth the significance of that scene!) Above all we see the prophet, type of that very nationalism so strong in the Old Testament, reluctant to go to Nineveh and preach, because in his heart he suspected that God had wider sympathies than the prophet's theology allowed Him,—we see the prophet rebuked and shamed by the revelation of the love of God for other men and other races, a love that cares for men as men, for children, even for the beasts. The spirit of internationalism comes to fine flower in the book of Jonah.

Some of the prophets are uncompromising in their sense that Israel has a monopoly of the favor of God. But one clear note of protest sounds from the last chapter of Amos, in which the man of God tells Israel that they are not the only people God cares for and favors. Even as He brought up Israel from Egypt, so has He brought up the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir. The nation that is truly God's Chosen is the *righteous* nation. How sturdy in its sense of a universal reign of law is the opening sermon

of Amos, where, after denouncing the sins of the surrounding nations, the prophet declares that Israel and Judah shall be judged exactly as Edom and Moab and Ammon are to be judged.

The 63rd chapter of Isaiah may show us a nationalistic hero, red with the blood of other peoples, justly slain that Israel may be set on high above them; but the 42nd chapter of Isaiah, and the other great "Servant" passages show us a great, world-wide, humane destiny for the chosen people. They are to be "a light to the nations," and "a salvation to the ends of the earth." There is one inspired bit in which the prophet foresees a day in which Egypt and Assyria, the two great dread enemies of Israel, shall no longer be looked on as the enemies of God, but God is represented as saying, "Israel shall be a third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth; for that Jehovah of Hosts hath blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance."

The last book in the Old Testament strikes a clear and high note. The prophet represents Jehovah as protesting that He is not dependent on Israel for worship; "for from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, my name is great among the nations; and in every place in-

30 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

cense is offered unto my name, and a pure offering."

So, here and there in the Old Testament, far more frequently than we sometimes note, shines forth a faith in universal brotherhood, a light of true internationalism.

The fourth fact we should hold in mind is that in the Old Testament prophets we find the roots of our universal religion, and of our faith in the possibility and desirability of internationalism.

It should be to us a cause of profound encouragement, that it was in a time like that in which we are living that the foundations of faith in the one and only God were laid. A ruthless empire was over-running the earth, devouring small nations, breaking covenants, compelling the peace-loving to fight for life and freedom. And it was just then that, under the pressure of the world-situation, the great prophets of the eighth century before Christ awoke to the mighty truth that there is but One God for all the earth and all the races upon it. He it is Who calls and commands, uses, and throws aside, the mightiest monarchs and empires. He rules in heaven and earth. Such a faith in the One God lies at the basis of all our religion, and all our faith in the possibility of international law and order.

The first commandment reflects the earlier conception: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." It is not a declaration that there is no other God, not even a demand that Israel shall acknowledge no other God as real and existent. It is a command to Israel not to set other gods in Jehovah's presence. "Though there be gods many, yet for us there is but one God"; that was Israel's attitude. But Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah laid the granite foundations of ethical and universal religion when they proclaimed that in all the universe there is no God but Jehovah. Faith in the one God of all humanity is the very basis of true internationalism. The question which compels all true men who face it to answer in terms of internationalism is the great query of Malachi; "Have we not all one Father? Did not one God create us?"

So, even in the Old Testament, is found the conception of internationalism, clear evidence that God's aim was to make a people who should be servants of humanity, that all men might come at last to a unity of faith in the one God, their Father. Seldom, or never, reaching the height of the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ, mingled with reactionary statements and impulses of exclusive patriotism, realized by only a few who climbed to

the heights while the mass lingered in the low places, this conception of the unity of the race nevertheless haunted the consciousness of the Hebrew seers, who saw in the world's life a movement toward a goal set forth in the words of a gifted soul, "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God, as the waters cover the sea."

Under the inspiration of this prophetic vision, Judaism had become to a limited extent, even before Christ came, a missionary religion, with a desire to bring all sorts and races of men together. Too often its missionary zeal was fierce, crude, intolerant, stained with an offensive sense of superiority. Yet some there were who saw the glory of the wider view, like Philo who tried to combine the Old Testament with Plato's dialogues, that men might have one great fountain of inspiration for their thought and worship of God.

In making ready for the coming of Jesus Christ, the Old Testament made ready for the coming of universal religion, of international goodwill, of the fellowship of nations, of the brotherhood of man.

And all along the way, the greatest influence of the Old Testament toward internationalism was in its clear consciousness that God is fundamentally a God of principles rather than of people, a God of justice, righteousness, freedom, and law, rather than a God tied to the fortunes of one race, re-

gardless of the moral and religious character of that race. Such a faith made for a sane internationalism a foundation of God that cannot be moved, but abideth forever.

CHAPTER III

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND INTERNATIONALISM

ONE might expect, in passing from the Old Testament to the New, to come out of the twilight into the clear day, to find full and unequivocal support for the cause of internationalism in the Gospel and the literature which grew from it.

But this is not the case. Jesus gives us not a word of clear, specific teaching about international relationships. Just as the ardent internationalist is tempted to throw over the Old Testament because a rampant nationalism is so patent on the surface of much of it, so he is tempted to turn from the New Testament because it is so individualistic in tone and view.

In fact there are three characteristics of the teachings of Christ which repel some thoughtful socially-minded folk, and fortify some of the reactionary and unprogressive elements in the church.

The first of these is what we may call the *conservatism of Jesus*. He seems so content with things as they are. He makes attack upon so few

political abuses or social evils. The tyranny of Rome was a very real and very oppressive fact for the mass of men; but He never denounces it; He discourages rather than foments revolt against it. He is put to death at last as a disturber of the peace, an enemy of the existing order; but the flimsy and false charge breaks down. In fact there has scarcely been, in all the riot of misinterpretation of Jesus, a conception of Him more out of touch with the facts as we know them, than the representation of Him as a social reformer, an agitator, a rebel against the existing order. Those who present Christ in this garb are reading their own thoughts and beliefs and hopes back into Him, and making Him their incarnation, just as truly and as absolutely as is the veriest mystic who depicts Jesus as always crowned with a halo of heavenliness. His words and acts were marked with a strong conservatism.

The second characteristic we note is the limited range of His directions and principles. If, as we profess to believe, He came to be our guide, He left many paths uncharted. Nothing is easier, in principle, than to conduct one's life on the basis of "In His Steps," asking "what would Jesus do?" Nothing is harder than to discover what Jesus would do, in those wide ranges of modern thought and conduct which He never entered. So

many questions that are real and vital to us seem out of His range. The nearest approach He made to the problem of the relation of a godly man to political and governmental action was in the counsel, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's"; illuminating, abiding, in its insight; but vague as a definite direction; for it leaves entirely untouched the really bothersome question, "What really *is* Cæsar's, and what really *is* God's?"

How many and how grave are the practical matters on which we go in vain to the specific statements of the Gospel for guidance! Child labor, the rights of women, democracy in industry, the limits of patriotism, the use of force, the right to go to war,—these are a few of the questions which sometimes seem to us matters wellnigh of life and death; and on them He is silent. He set up few guide-posts.

Many have raised the question of late, What would the Good Samaritan have done had he come upon the scene a little earlier, while the thieves were assaulting the traveler? Would Jesus have made the hero of the parable join in the fight, use force to rescue the victim? The pacifist is sure He would not; the mass of Christians believe He would. Many of us find ourselves wishing that the Master, here and elsewhere, had made the way

of practical godliness a little more plain before our feet.

The third marked characteristic of His teaching which sometimes disconcerts us, which will surely mislead us unless we are on guard, is the individualism of it. Jesus deals with men one by one, as if each man stood alone with God. He is very sensitive to human relations, very clear that godliness must and will work out good social values; but He seems scarcely conscious of the network of social forces and movements which at times make us feel as if we could hardly call ourselves individuals.

When we grasp these characteristics of the thought and conduct of Jesus, and see their immense significance for our modern lives, we wonder if we can hold that the New Testament has any vital connection with social progress, and the movement toward international order. We remember how Bismarck said, "If I were not a Christian, I would be a republican"; and we wonder whether there may not be some fact-basis for the feeling that the religion of the New Testament and the social-democratic movement have little in common.

The Christian, whose rule of life is to follow Christ, must face these facts honestly. After all, that is the very primary element in following

Christ, to face facts honestly. How shall we meet the difficulties created by these facts? We meet them by the frank admission that Christ was not, is not, and never meant to be, a giver of rules, a law-maker, an instructor in the details of life's technique. His method and aim were quite different.

First, we can see very readily certain conditions which necessitated some limitation of the range and the specific guiding value of His teachings:

Patriotism, for example, was an impossibility in His day. He could not approach the subject without at once endangering His life and work. It was only by extreme caution that He was able to keep three years clear for His work.

Again, there is a very real sense in which He was limited by His time. Had He spoken words specifically applicable to the conditions of modern industry, or of modern social development, such words would have thrown Him out of gear with His own time, would have made Him a portent, a thing of magic. One of His chief glories is the perfect naturalness with which He fits into history.

On the other hand, the limitation we note in His teachings and in His attitude toward specific questions is due in part to the fact that He was for all time, and all conditions, and therefore could not

attend with too great particularity to those conditions which were peculiar to His own day and place. When He did come close to the peculiar thoughts and theories of His day, as, for example, in the "little apocalypse" recorded in the 24th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, misunderstanding has arisen, and literalists have been all too ready to take the transient form of His teaching for its inner meaning. He was for the ages, and a certain measure of detachment from the concerns of any particular age was vital to the success of His eternal mission.

But the reason for the limited range of His practical guidance and example lies deeper than these explanations. When we come to a true view of Jesus and His teaching, we see clearly that His method and His aim were such as to forbid dealing overmuch with specific details.

His method finds statement in the saying, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." He was constructive, not destructive. He was concerned not with the taking away of evil things but with the starting of good things that should in time displace the evil. He did come to "take away the sin of the world"; but His method of taking it away was to establish and confirm goodness. He would always set up a positive ideal, give men a spirit in which to breathe and live, and trust the ideal, the

spirit to overcome in time the evil in the world.

This was His method with the law, and with the whole system of Jewish exclusiveness. When Paul saw the law, he smote it, with a fierce joy at being privileged to help break it to bits. But one searches in vain for any iconoclasm in the soul of Jesus. He even spoke words that gave the Judaistic Christians in the early church some excuse for claiming that their Master intended that they should always be good Jews. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets." "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." "Go show yourself to the priest." "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, the same shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven."

But He introduced, as the essential element of religion, as its very heart, the principle or ideal of free, filial love to God; and in the end it was not chiefly Paul's sledge-hammer blows, but Jesus' doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, that brought the law to impotence, and made the Jewish Christian ashamed of his heritage of exclusiveness.

Such has been Christ's method in dealing with slavery. It was a hideous and monstrous evil in His day, a curse on slave and master. Must not Jesus have seen what it meant? Yet where in His teachings can one find a clear, specific word deal-

ing with the problem of slavery? He assumes slaves and serfs as part of the order of society.

But He brings into form and into force the great principle of brotherhood, of the dignity and worth of each soul of man in the eyes of God; and ultimately, slowly, yet certainly, slavery finds itself on the defensive, and losing ground, and at last is vanquished. Christ has done it; yet He never definitely attacked the institution of slavery.

So has it been in the matter of exploitation of women and children. Here the Master did come nearer to a positive and specific rule, in His clear direction with reference to marriage and divorce, and His warnings against those who despise the children or make them stumble. Yet the principle holds, that He set up an ideal, and left it to work the ruin of the systems that profited from the weakness of women and children. He taught the sacredness of personality, the loftiness and beauty of love; and that force has driven the world so far as it has progressed toward fairness to woman and child.

He gave no definite instructions as to the relation of His followers to war. There have been honest followers of Jesus who feel that He commanded non-resistance; there have been Christians of equal honesty that have gone into battle with

clean consciences and a sense of deep consecration as they fought against their fellowmen. How painfully earnest Christians have searched the Gospel for light on their duty in time of war! And to what widely-separated views their studies have led them.

Yet if ever, as we firmly believe and hope, war shall follow slavery to the limbo of discarded follies and crimes, the mightiest force in sending it thither will have been the leadership of Jesus Christ. For His great principle of brotherly love is fundamentally incompatible with war, and sooner or later one of them must go, vanquished by the other. Christ started a society, a brotherhood, destined to unite the world. Better and more surely than by any frontal attack, He thereby made internationalism a certainty of the world's future life.

But not only His method, His aim also explains His lack of definiteness. For His aim, as the Great Teacher of men, was, and ever is, not to relieve the reason and conscience of mankind, not to lighten the burden of thought and study; but rather to increase that burden, to make men more conscientious, more eager, more active in mind and moral sense.

That is to say, He came not to answer questions, but to ask them; not to settle men's souls,

but to provoke them; not to save men from problems, but to save them from their indolence; not to make life easier, but to make it more educative. We are quite in error when we think of Christ as coming to give us a key to life's difficult text-book. He came to give us a finer text-book, calling for keener study, and deeper devotion, and more intelligent and persistent reasoning. The fact has been noted that when Jesus gave the first great commandment, He added to the Deuteronomic statement the necessity that we love God with all our *mind*. His aim was ever to challenge men to the fullest, deepest use of their powers.

Christ's teachings are to us what the compass is to the mariner. We mis-state their use as we mis-state the function of the compass. We say sometimes that a sailor need not go astray, because he has a magic needle which will always point the way for him. But the compass does not do that. If the mariner steers always where the needle points, he will make shipwreck soon. What the compass does is to point out a direction; and on the basis of that, the mariner determines his course. But he must take pains to see that no mass of iron or steel is near to deflect the needle, he must allow for variations of the needle, he must take careful observations to determine his immediate location, and he must study his chart

to know what lies about his ship in that place; only then can he sail safely. So to the Christian Christ points out a star, sets forth unerringly an ideal, a principle. But the Christian must free himself from prejudices and preceptions and selfish motives, he must allow for accidents of form and statement in Christ's sayings, he must see and interpret the circumstances in which he is set, and he must read and study to know his course.

There is of course a danger in stating thus the function and limitation of Christ's leadership,—a danger that we shall be content to admire His ideals and principles, without making positive and definite connection between them and our practical conduct, that we shall yield Him only a sentimental and theoretical obedience. We must ever remind ourselves that our obedience to him, while never literal, must always be serious. Better the extreme of literal following than the extreme of contentment with a dream of following. After all, the literalists, St. Francis and Tolstoi, and the like, have made upon the world a mighty impression of reality in their religion. Better too literal than too elastic.

But better far than either the literal or the loose is the real, wholesome follower of Jesus, who takes the great ideals of the Gospel, and with sincerity, courage, simplicity, and earnest thoughtfulness

tries to make the details of his conduct and relationships realize those principles of Jesus.

Taken thus, the Gospel gives wonderful support to the cause of internationalism; for it gives ideals and a spirit which ultimately demand a sane and far-going internationalism. When Jesus deliberately chose from the Old Testament the ideal of the Servant rather than the ideal of the War-Lord, He set in motion forces which will eventually set war aside. Paul saw the tendency, when, in the opening chapters of his Epistle to the Ephesians, he says of Christ, "For He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, so making peace." When Kant wrote his epochal tract on Durable Peace, in 1795, he gave as one of the three conditions of stable peace the extension of the spirit of goodwill between races and nations,—the very work of Christ.

In the social life of the present are two extreme types, each of which seriously hinders the progress of society toward an international order. They are the Militarist and the Pacifist. I use each term in an opprobrious sense. By the militarist I mean one who holds war to be necessary, and good; who counts it one of the chief duties of a state to be completely ready for war at any time; and who regards war as the ultimate arbiter in

human affairs. By the pacifist I mean the non-resistant, the Tolstoyan, the one who holds that the use of physical force is immoral, or, in any event, that war is always unjustifiable, and that no Christian can rightly take part in it.

We need to see clearly that neither of these extreme types can claim the sanction of Christ. Certainly the militarist cannot. No one can be a militarist and a Christian. For the militaristic view contradicts Christ's trust in man, in love, in the essential goodness of God and of life; it denies ground for the hopefulness and the joy which is of the very stuff of the Christian spirit.

But, while the pacifist may make out a better case, he too is far from the kingdom of Christ. Certainly we can say this at least, that one need not be a pacifist to be a Christian; and the pacifist misses the balance of Christ. He glorifies method above spirit; he makes a fetich of one saying, taken with bald literalism.

Christ does say, "Resist not evil." But to center the Gospel on that saying, as Tolstoi did, is to reveal a condition of painful religious astigmatism. Why take that saying with a literalism we cannot apply elsewhere? Does not the Master go on to say, "Give to every one that asketh thee"? Shall I then let my child have poison, or unlimited sweets, if he asks for them? "From

him that would take thy goods, ask them not again." Shall we let burglars roam at will through our streets and homes, and leave them in undisturbed possession of whatever they may fancy to take? Is not the Tolstoyan caught in his own trap when he comes to the counsel,—no less positive and explicit than the command not to resist evil,—“Whoso would compel thee to go one mile, go with him two”? For the verb in that sentence means government action, conscription, demand for military service or assistance. It has passed into technical use as the legal term “Angarry,” “Jus Angariae,” under the sanction of which the United States lately took over the ships of Holland. Literally, then, the verse bears the meaning, “If the government demands service of you, conscripts you, give double what is demanded.”

War is a brutal, a detestable business, which could have no place in a world ordered according to the ideals of Jesus Christ. In such a judgment all true Christians must agree. Yet when, for our sins and the sins of our fathers, or for the sins of our contemporaries of which we may be comparatively guiltless, war has come, and, so far as we can see, freedom and joy and justice for the future hang upon the issue of the conflict, it is pitiful to see men content to base their Christian attitude

and duty on the letter of one saying of Christ, when life is challenging them to a decision so great that all the light God has given to all men is not too much to illumine the path, and all the reason and conscience they possess must be taxed to the utmost to find the worthy response. "War is hell"; but "though I make my bed in hell, behold Thou art there"; and sometimes one must be willing to descend into hell if he would keep company with Christ.

Thus, though the Master of Christians said no specific word about international relations, He set in motion forces, principles, ideals, which, given fair and full opportunity, will work out an international brotherhood, in which nations shall live together like neighbors in God's great city. It is not without profound significance that the narrative of His life shows us shepherds from the countryside and Wise Men from distant lands, meeting at His cradle; and that over His cross hung a placard, written in Hebrew, and Latin, and Greek; for all the world was concerned in Him, the Son of Man. To leave out Christ and His Gospel would be to leave out the mightiest force making for internationalism. For the spirit He taught and exemplified is the very source of our hope of a better and more brotherly world. No one can pray the Lord's Prayer, in a large and worthy

spirit, and not be an internationalist; for to pray "Thy Kingdom come" is to pray for righteousness, peace, and joy the world over; and to pray "Thy will be done on earth as it is done in the heavens" is to consecrate one's self to the ideal of a human society in which the various states shall move in harmony and order such as mark the courses of the stars, great and small alike controlled by the mighty, majestic, and perfect will of God.

Christ is no dreamer; His Gospel is no purely individualistic message, unrelated to the vast social questions and political programs of our great day. He does stand nearer to the dreamer than to the materialist. If we must choose, give us Tolstoi as an example of what it means to be a man of God, rather than Bismarck; give us poor, helpless, befuddled Russia as a national ideal, rather than cold-blooded, hard-hearted, efficient Prussia. But the choice is not confined to those extremes. There is "a more excellent way." I dare to hold up, as nearer than either Tolstoi or Bismarck to the Gospel ideal of what a man should be in his relation to the practical affairs of the world, a better Christian, a better internationalist than either, our own Lincoln. Committed to peace and justice and Christian idealism as truly as was the soul of the great Russian prophet, the very hero

of democracy and of humane social conduct, yet firm and relentless in his pursuit of justice and order, he has left us an example of the man who is true to Christ without forfeiting his part in the stern tasks of the social order. "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right,"—that is a spirit caught from Christ. We see in Lincoln a truer, saner example of what it means to live in the world after Christ's spirit and way than we see in the Prussian statesman or in the Russian mystic; and we dare to say that in Lincoln's America we find a closer approximation to the ideal of a Christian nation, and a mightier force toward enduring peace and a right international-order, than in Militarist Prussia or Pacifist Russia.

It is in Christ, His Gospel, His spirit, that true internationalism finds its best expression, its mightiest help, its surest hope. And some day the parable of the Prodigal will be fulfilled on a world-scale, and the whole race of mankind will arise and go to the Father in penitence for its past, henceforth to live the life of the family of God, as He taught us to live in Christ Jesus. Then will come the great days of a Christian world-order.

CHAPTER IV

CHRISTIANITY AND INTERNATIONALISM

WHEN we speak of the relation of Christianity to Internationalism, we may mean only that with which the last chapter deals,— the relation of the great principles and ideals and faiths of the Christian system to the movement for a better international order.

But Christianity is more than a system of faiths and principles. It is an institution, a movement, a part of human history, a factor in social evolution.

The Christian faith took shape in an institution; more than that, it worked itself into many institutions. It became a movement. The principles and ideals of Christianity profoundly influenced the social and political development of the race, and that development in turn reacted upon the faiths and forms of the Christian church.

Jesus left no set forms or institutions for the brotherhood He founded. He never used the word "church" in the formal, technical sense of that term. He created a brotherhood, with latent

power to become a world religion; but He showed a divine carelessness for the forms it might take to itself.

When the forms of organization appeared, they took on at once a new and a universal meaning and appeal. Christianity took shape in an international institution, as a religion for all men, transcending the bounds of nationality and class.

It was a movement profoundly significant for internationalism, no less than for religion, which began at Antioch, a movement so novel that it had to find a new name. Up to that time Christianity had been no more than a Jewish sect. But the ideas and faiths which were central in it naturally led its adherents to where they could not help passing over the bounds of their own race. Christ had spoken words prophetic of the universal range of His influence: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." "Ye shall be my witnesses — unto the uttermost part of the earth." True, these words were not so precise, and clear, and indubitable, nor was the message of universal brotherhood so single, that there was no room for doubt or hesitation. It took the vision on the roof of Joppa to convince Peter that Gentiles had a right to the privileges of the church. A sharp and long conflict was necessary before Paul could lead the church as a whole into a world-

view of its mission. But Christianity came to that world-view, that consciousness of a universal mission, and it then stood forth in its real meaning and power, as an organization transcending all bounds and limits, so that "in Christ Jesus there can be neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman; but Christ is all and in you all."

Here we find one of the reasons for the rapid spread of early Christianity. The world was ready for a religion that took the world into its view, a religion international in character and conviction. Rome had, in a way, unified the world; perhaps in the only way then possible, by imperial dominion. One has but to read Hatch's "Influence of Greek Usage on the Christian Church," or Harnack's "Mission and Expansion of Christianity," to realize how marvelously the world which primitive Christianity faced was a unit. There was easy communication by road and by speech. Rome laid the roads, and Greece provided the language. Paul could speak wellnigh anywhere without the need of an interpreter. There were many wandering lecturers, teachers, preachers, prophets of strange cults, old and new; there were guilds of working-men, with features that strike us as quite modern, such as sickness benefits, and burial provision and the like. There was easy

passage from one place to another; on a tomb in Phrygia was found an inscription telling that the merchant there buried had made the journey to Rome seventy-two separate times. It was not unlike our 19th century, this first century of the Christian era. Into this world, diversified yet one, came Christianity, with its passion for humanity, its exaltation of brotherhood into a creed, its identification of the supreme man, the Lord of all, not with kings and mighty men, but with the lowly, with carpenters and fishermen, its glow of impatience toward artificial distinctions. The world was ready for an inclusive religion, which would exalt the brother of low degree, and bring down the pride of the rich and mighty, by the revelation of the greatness of the soul into which Christ came.

Why was it that Rome, so tolerant of all forms of religion, made implacable war upon Christianity? Largely, no doubt, because of its uncompromising spirit. It opposed to the imperial worship a worship that tended to make men conscious of their unity quite apart from their connection with the Roman empire. Rome saw that here was something new, a new international force and movement, a rival to the Empire.

It is amazing how swiftly, and how thoroughly, the Christian church grew into an organism which

the Empire had reason to view with respect and with fear. The growth was largely due to the international character of Christianity. It refused respect to the things that divided men. It held their allegiance to a kingdom transcending all bounds and distinctions. In those first centuries Christianity stood for a sublime ideal, a new international force. What a stupendous change in the point of view when a Roman Emperor put upon his banner a cross,—symbol of Rome's heaviest and most disgraceful punishment for crime and sedition. It was as if the Kaiser should substitute for the Prussian Eagle one of Raemakers' tragic figures symbolizing Belgium under the heel of Germany.

One of the chief glories of those early centuries was the vivid consciousness that the church was a unity transcending all distinctions, a supra-national body. That fact set the church above emperors. One of the great scenes in Christian history is the picture of Ambrose, refusing the sacrament to the great Theodosius, until he should repent of his bloody slaughter of the Thessalonians. In the name of the sacred brotherhood of humanity, the Christian prelate stood above the Emperor.

For some hundreds of years the Catholic Church stood splendid and mighty as the representative of an international, or supra-national

force. Amid much that was evil and false in that ancient Catholic Church there was this at least of good, that it claimed the first allegiance of men to something higher than their political rulers, something which united men of different races, even when they made war upon each other, something inclusive of their racial divisions, a visible representative of the ideal of the Kingdom of God on earth.

But the church fell from its high estate. It is interesting to speculate and dream on what the Catholic Christian Church might have been and done in the life of Europe, had it kept faith with its high ideal, steered clear of politics, and given itself to its sacred work, holding its ideal of a universal brotherhood clearly before kings, instead of taking their tricks and ambitions as its own method and spirit, and finally coming to where it was more concerned with crowning and uncrowning emperors than with telling them the truth of God and man. It was a tragic fall from Ambrose to Hildebrand. The church failed because it substituted for its real, high, spiritual internationalism an imperial internationalism, in which the title "Roman" came to mean more than either "Christian" or "Catholic."

From the political point of view, there were two glaring errors on the part of the Catholic Church

which made the Reformation necessary. The first was that the church became imperialistic; the second was that it resisted the growth of healthy nationalism.

The Reformation was necessary because freedom is more precious than unity. Internationalists must ever remember that. Incidentally so must all who work for church unity. When the interests of freedom and of unity conflict, unity must go. The passion of patriotism, the instinct of nationality, the desire of racial groups to be independent political entities, self-ruling and free, was wholesome and irresistible. It is still strong, an instinct to be reckoned with, not to be ignored without penalty. One of the issues of the war is "the right of self-determination for all nations, great or small." No internationalism will be really stable or valuable which violates that principle.

Yet we cannot withhold regret that the Reformation broke the sense that Christianity was a supra-national body, and produced churches organized on national lines. How painfully little there seemed to be when the war flamed up of the consciousness of Christianity as transcending national issues, and particular loyalties! The most glaring illustration of the complete victory of the nationalistic conception of Christianity over the

supra-nationalistic was in the haste and vehemence with which the churchmen of Germany ranged themselves as a matter of course on the side of their country. But in what nation has the church proved itself more than a patriotic partisan? Has it, in a single instance, shown itself dominated by a consciousness of an allegiance transcending its loyalty to the one nation? It may be that the hesitation on the part of the American church to pronounce judgment at once against Germany, a hesitation so heavily scored by some critics as due to cowardice and want of moral vision, was in part due to a dim, haunting sense that Christianity ought to beware of partisanship, ought to stand for something "above the battle," something not lightly to be exchanged for partisan satisfaction. In any event the war gave us a startling revelation of the thoroughness with which the church had been split into national groups, how completely it had lost its international character. The head of one of the leading theological schools in America publicly declared in a recent gathering of clergy, that in his opinion the church could have no higher function than to stand for and stimulate patriotism, to become an agent or a function of the national life.

Yet, serious as has been this loss of the international consciousness of the Christian church, the

Reformation on the whole meant gain, not loss, in the long out-working of a true internationalism. For the true development of an international life and order lay along the lines of federation, which must be built upon a wholesome and thoroughgoing development of independent nationalities; and the Protestant movement, dividing the church into national and local groups, did get closer than it could otherwise have done to the spirit and life of the people, came to share their deepest aspirations, and worked with the separate groups toward that international order which will come at last from the inter-relation of strong, self-conscious, independent states.

Imperial unity was, and always must be, a colossal failure. The alternative is federative unity, such as has been realized on a small scale in Switzerland, in a more impressive way in the United States of America, and most remarkably in the British Empire. For the outworking of such federative unity a period of intense nationalistic development was necessary; and the Protestant movement, by furthering and encouraging that process through the establishment of nationalistic churches, played an indispensable part in making ready for the new order of internationalism.

Nor has the Protestant Christian church wholly lost, even during this period of nationalistic de-

velopment, its consciousness of an international mission and function. It has been doing a work of immense significance for internationalism in the foreign missionary enterprise.

The missionaries have, of course, been sent out, supported, directed, by the national churches. That has worked harm, and impaired the catholic and Christian value of the missions established. There has been too much eagerness to make Christians of one particular stamp, too much desire to propagate a Christianity distinguished by special creeds and forms and orders. Moreover too often the fact that missions have been national enterprises has been used unscrupulously by political governments to advance their national interests. Trade has pushed in, following the missionary, and political control has followed trade. Irreparable damage has been done to the cause of Christ by such acts as that of the seizure of Kiao-Chau in punishment for the murder of two German missionaries. "Spheres of influence" have too often been claimed on the basis of missionary operations on the part of national churches. But such acts of injustice can not be laid to the charge of the church, save as the church has failed to protest against them. On the whole the Protestant churches have, in their foreign missionary operations, kept a high and true sense of

the supra-national character of their work and of their faith.

And how great and true has been the influence of missions toward real international good-will and order! The missionary enterprise has strongly tended to the standardizing of thought, conduct, and customs. It has thus brought the nations nearer to a common life. To take some of the best of our western folk and set them down quietly in some crowded center of Oriental life, to exemplify every day and year after year what it means to be a Christian neighbor and citizen and friend, has been of untold advantage. What the Settlement has done for social good-will and progress in our home cities, that the mission compound has done in many a foreign locality.

Missions have opened the way to trade, a great influence for internationalism. While commerce has often made for the debasement of backward peoples, yet on the whole it has tended to bring the world together, and to establish connections that bind men of varied nations and races to each other.

Of immensely greater importance is the fact that the work of Foreign Missions has put into effect the creed of human equality. It recognizes and acknowledges no bar of race or color. It takes to all men the chief blessings enjoyed by the

most favored races, with a simple but fargoining faith that all men deserve the same goods of life, and that these foreigners are capable of receiving the best we have and of being transformed by it.

Foreign Missions greatly help the cause of internationalism by bringing into play the forces of Christian trust, sacrifice, and service.

Set the nations at serving each other, let them follow Jesus in taking as their ideal, not the "War-Lord" of the Messianic Psalms, but the "Servant of the Lord" of the great exilic prophecies, and the day of international good-will and order will speedily dawn. Here the Christian churches have been pioneers, in this sympathetic, self-sacrificing, serviceable enterprise of missions. They have rendered this service, moreover, precisely in the sensitive places, where our peace is jeopardized and our antagonisms find fuel, and wars have their obscure and hidden roots. It is only a superficial view that reckons this a war about Alsace-Lorraine, and Serbia, and Italia Irredenta. It is far more truly a war about Mesopotamia, and China, and Persia, and Africa, yes, and Mexico. Christian missions have been powerful and indispensable agents of the coming internationalism in interpreting these backward races to the powerful nations of the West, and mediating between the weakness of the one and the strength of the other.

But the greatest contribution of the missionary enterprise to the cause of internationalism has been the winning of men of all races and conditions to a single allegiance to the Son of Man, and to a brotherhood of faith and service in Him. Missions have been creating a nucleus of internationally-minded folk, and that not alone on the mission field. The supporters of the missionary enterprise in the home lands have been receiving a steady education in the international spirit and mind. One cannot really be enthusiastic for missions and not be a thorough-going internationalist.

Closely associated with the missionary movement as an agency making for internationalism,—part of that movement indeed, in the right and large interpretation — are the great world-movements for the betterment of mankind, of which the Young Men's Christian Association is the most conspicuous example. The whole world has been impressed with the resourcefulness and power with which this Association has taken hold of the moral and religious problems connected with the war, the sane and wise way in which it has provided the Christian ministry the men need in the camps and trenches. But not all have realized that this power to meet the present exigency was accumulated during years and decades of development, in which the Young Men's Christian Association

64 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

was becoming more and more a movement of Christian Internationalism. The Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference is another striking illustration of the fact that the real spirit of the Christian Church is an international spirit.

Such movements as the Young Men's Christian Association and the Red Cross are not in any sense competitors of the church; they are not in reality auxiliary to the church. They are the church functioning in the only possible way Protestant Christianity could function. Critics who condemn the church for leaving to "outside organizations" the work of ministry to soul and body which is being done by the Young Men's Christian Association and the Red Cross might as well condemn a mother for sending her children to school instead of teaching them herself, or buying their clothing ready made instead of stitching it at home. The conclusive answer to such criticism is the question, What could the Protestant church have done, had it tried to meet the needs of the war situation, save to organize just such movements as the Young Men's Christian Association and the Red Cross? It is of the very essence of Protestantism to foster a spirit, and leave it free to take what forms it will. And these great organizations are simply natural and

effective forms which the spirit of Protestant Christianity has taken to itself for certain specific and important ends.

The early part of the present century was marked by the strong growth of an international consciousness on the part of the organized church. Churchmen in Great Britain and Germany felt the burden of responsibility for lessening the growing suspicion and estrangement between their countries, and a society was formed for bringing about better relations between the churchmen in Great Britain and Germany. This led to a general movement, which took definite shape at a council held at Constance in late July and early August, 1914, just as the war broke out. It was a little company that gathered there, for the clouds of war were thick; but representatives of some twelve or more different nationalities met as Christian brothers to plan for the revival of the spirit of Christian brotherhood between men of different races. No one who was present can ever forget those sessions; they were prophetic of better days to come, when the church shall have regained its lost supranational character, and the middle walls of partition shall again have been broken down by Christ, the maker of Peace.

Out of this Conference at Constance came the World Alliance for Promoting International

66 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

Friendship through the Churches, which, though hampered and almost halted by the war, has nevertheless preserved a healthy and vigorous life, and promises much for Christian internationalism in the future. One ventures to predict that, though the racial divisions of Christendom have been torn apart by the strong hand of war, when once that grip is loosened, the groups on either side that will be most ready to renew relations of goodwill and knit up again the fabric of severed friendships, will be these groups of Christians, who see and accept the international implications of the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Internationalism has been, through all the history of the church, a part of its vital spirit. With all its faults, despite its piteous weaknesses and its heinous sins, the Christian Church has acted as a force to draw men together, to make them conscious of a real unity transcending their external differences, to make them dissatisfied with a divided world, restless until there is among the severed parts of humanity an at-one-ment, a reconciliation.

Moreover the missionary enterprise has reacted vigorously upon the international movement. For missions find themselves hampered at every step by selfish aggrandizement at the expense of the weak and backward races to which the church

ministers through its missionary enterprise. Next to the baleful influence of the evil individual who misrepresents Christianity in the sight of the Orient, the missionary enterprise suffers most from the influence of the immoral conduct of so-called Christian nations. Nothing could give so powerful an impetus to missions as could a righteous solution of the relation between East and West, between the Great Powers and the great needy races, an international order that shall "set judgment in the earth."

Christianity and Internationalism are one and the same. Internationalism is essentially Christian, in origin and spirit and cardinal tenets. Christianity is essentially international, in character and faith. One cannot be a true Christian and not be a true internationalist. Christianity stands, the first great movement in history, the only great movement in religion, the founder of which left as his great commission to his followers a command to go to "all nations," and as the goal of their efforts a kingdom the citizens of which shall be a "great multitude which no man can number, out of every kindred and tribe and nation and tongue," living together as one great family, working out their common life in freedom and in peace, a world kept one by the free spirit of man and the Holy Spirit of God.

CHAPTER V

DEMOCRACY AND INTERNATIONALISM

THE war has brought many watchwords into use. So great and diversified a conflict must find expression in many phrases and slogans. But here in America, and in many another country as well, the one word that would be chosen, should we be restricted to a single term, would undoubtedly be "democracy."

President Wilson has made this the key-word of the war. It has been well said that even more significant than the entry of America into the war was the way the President brought America in. Instantly "democracy" became a shining emblem on our banners, the watchword of the war.

It is not, as the President has said clearly and positively, that we are embarking on a crusade to make the world democratic. We have neither the right nor the power to decide what form of government any nation shall adopt. An enforced democracy would be a contradiction in terms. But we have the right and the duty, and we think we have the power, to see that democracy has a

fair field and a free chance, that peoples everywhere shall be at liberty to establish and maintain democratic institutions, if they so desire, and that popular governments, wherever set up, shall not be endangered by the intrigues of autocratic cliques.

The President's addresses have made increasingly clear the fact that the dominant issue in the war is this issue of democracy. The latest concise definition of our aim makes it clear: "What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed, and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

We see that the world can be no longer safe if autocratic governments are left free and uncontrolled. We are beginning to see the priceless values of democracy. One of the chief benefits of the war is the recovery of that sense of the value and glory of simple democratic ideals which we had so nearly lost. Not many years ago one heard much complaint about the ill-working of democracy, with an occasional sigh for "the strong man, who can rule," with emphatic words about the slowness, the inefficiency, the corruption, the clumsiness of popular government. Such complaints have ceased, and all through our country is a profound conviction that popular government, however inefficient, and slow, and cumber-

70 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

some it may be in contrast with the processes of autocracy, is worth all it costs.

If we would work toward a sane and lasting internationalism, we must realize how intimate is its connection with democracy. Autocracy is as incompatible with the right order of political affairs as slavery was. Dr. Talcott Williams makes a strong and true historical comparison when he says that our war of 1860 was to put an end to the impious theory that certain races were made to serve other races, while the present war is to put down the twin blasphemy that certain families were made to rule other families.

As long ago as 1795, Kant published a pamphlet on the conditions of durable peace, in which he said that the world would never have lasting peace until the ultimate control of governmental processes rested in the hands of the people, rather than in the hands of kings or select groups. It is interesting to note the fact that the great philosopher, old and honored as he was, was publicly snubbed by the King of Prussia, as he might have been by the latest of the Kaisers. We are coming to see with increasing clearness that Kant was right in naming the democratization of the nations as one condition of lasting peace.

What do we mean by the word "democracy"? We do not mean, above all, a form of government.

We include that as the best or surest means to the end we seek. But we really mean something like this, do we not? — *a square deal and a fair chance for the average man and the average family*; and we mean also a conviction that the best way to secure and safeguard that state of fairness is through letting the ultimate responsibility and authority rest in the hands of the mass of the people.

The democracy for which we are fighting is not Bolshevism, or any class-conscious rule. For class-domination violates one of the essential features of true democracy, by excluding some elements of the population from participation in the government. To exchange the rule of one class for the rule of another may be a step in progress, but it is not an advance in democracy. Mr. Raymond Robins tells of hearing an impassioned agitator at a meeting of workingmen cry out, "Oh, you men in your automobiles, we're going to change all that. We're going to pull you out of your autos and get in and ride ourselves." He says he could not refrain from asking, "Are you so foolish as to suppose that the big problems we are facing can ever be solved by changing the occupants of a lot of automobiles?" Some of us would frankly admit that, if it came to a choice between submitting to the rule of a Kaiser or to the rule of a proletariat, we would take the proletariat.

But democracy, as we see it, means the combined sense and power and action of all classes in the state. James Russell Lowell tells us that one of the defects in the American idea of democracy is that we think it means that any fellow off the street can run a locomotive without special training. Democracy does not imply a trust in the average man to do the business of governing better than the expert can do it. It implies a confidence in the honesty of the mass of men, and in their ability to find the man best fitted to govern. It means that we believe that, on the whole, we shall be more sure of getting the right men in office by letting the mass of people choose them than in any other way. And we think our faith is justified by comparing our list of Presidents, as to their ability and character and general fitness to govern, with the successive scions of any dynasty in any country.

Now this matter of democracy is a sacred matter. We come nearer to the rule of God and the will of God through ascertaining the will of the people and trusting the rule of the people than in any other way. One occasionally hears the strange doctrine advanced that neither democracy nor autocracy has divine sanction, that the true scriptural method of government is a theocracy. But one finds that most of those who stand for a rule of God rather than a rule of the people, mean

in practical effect the putting into force their own personal convictions and ideals.

The phrase, *vox populi vox dei*, may be but a half truth; but it is a half truth at least. Certainly we never hear *vox dei* more surely than when it speaks through *vox populi*. A real democracy would be the best expression we could get of the rule of God on earth. Democracy and true religion are vitally connected; each is essential to the other. Democracy thrives best when there is most pure Christianity. Religion flourishes best when democracy is purest, when there is the largest measure of freedom, equality, and fraternity, when wealth and opportunity and power are most evenly distributed.

Christian internationalism must be profoundly interested in democracy, for the Bible is a democratic book, and the Gospel is of one fabric with democracy. The Magnificat is a great hymn of social democracy. Christ is the founder of modern democracy as truly as of modern religion. Greece and Rome made their contributions to the growth of the democratic ideal; but the Hebrew was the real source of modern democracy.

In the stories of the dim and shadowy times of early Israel, we find a tale of great interest, dealing with the beginning of the monarchy in Israel.¹

¹ I Samuel 8.

Why was it that the prophet objected so vehemently to the setting up of a monarchy? Was it the desire of the priest to retain his power over the people? One cannot read the story and not catch the sense of a dim and vague conception of the *rule of the people*, hidden in the prophet's vehement desire that they should have no king but Jehovah. It is the same great instinct that has led a modern prophet of the people to talk of "God the Invisible King" as the hope of democratic progress. The prophet wanted the rule of God, as made clear to and in the conscience of the average man.

All through the history of the Hebrew people we find the prophets standing for popular rights as against royal prerogatives. The climax of Elijah's career is found in his noble and indignant protest against the seizure of Naboth's vineyard. It is interesting and illuminating to note that the Israelitish king did not dream of forcible violation of the rights of the humble citizen until his wife brought forward the plan. She had the background of the other nations of the time, where the king could do as he would. Ahab had the background of Hebrew history, and felt instinctively the sacredness of the rights of the people. In the freedom with which Nathan talked to David, and Ahijah to Solomon, and Isaiah to Ahaz, and Jere-

miah to Jehoiakin, we find recurring proofs of the profound sense that the cause of the people is the cause of God, and that kings must bend to its righteous demands.

Even more is the New Testament the source of real democracy. The beginning of modern democracy may be most truly found, if we seek one place and time for it, when Jesus looked into the eyes and into the heart of common men and women, and said, "You, just as you are,—not the mighty, but plain common people—you are the children of God and the heirs of the grace and glory of life." Those early Christian churches were the first truly democratic communities in the world, where men and women, regardless of distinctions, met on equal terms and voted for their officers. The synagogue of the Jew, the church of the Christian, the town meeting of the Puritan, the Congress of a democratic nation, the Soviets of Russia, these are phases of one movement, links in one chain of democratic progress.

The great watchwords of modern democratic progress, "Freedom, equality, brotherhood,"—these were watchwords of Christianity long before they were battle-cries of social progress. It was Christ Who said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," "All ye are brethren," "as ye would that men should do to you,

do ye even so to them." When that spirit came into the world, democracy came.

Some may raise the objection, some have raised it, that Christ is represented in the New Testament as a King, and His rule as a Kingdom; that the conception of Christianity is essentially monarchical. But the plain and sufficient answer is that there never was a government which rested more absolutely on the consent of the governed than does the rule of Christ. He will not rule over any one who does not choose Him freely as Lord. The vital principle of democracy that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" is fulfilled in the Kingdom of Christ as nowhere else.

We who are Protestants often overlook the splendid story of how the Holy Catholic Church stood for the preservation of democracy through the dark ages when barons and lords and kings held all political power in their hands. While the pernicious doctrine of the divine right of certain families was growing up and choking the seed of democracy, here stood a mighty organization, claiming the highest authority, exercising vast power, and any man, whatever his social rank, or his family lineage, or the amount of his possessions, was free to enter the church and to mount as high in its ranks as his abilities would carry

him, even to the chair founded by the fisherman of Galilee. We must not forget that splendid service of the Catholic Church to the cause of the people.

That cause of the people is holy, is Christian; it is the cause of God, of man, and of the Godman, Jesus Christ. It is the nearest and best fulfillment, in political and social life, of the ideal of the Kingdom of God. To serve it is to be a comrade of the apostles and prophets, a companion of Christ and of His Kingdom.

It is this cause of democracy which is involved in the present conflict, and which must win if ever we are to have a sure and safe and lasting international order. It has become increasingly clear, until it has become indubitable, that the war was brought upon the world by an autocratic clique, a group of men who held the power the people ought always to wield for themselves. Had there been in Germany even such a measure of popular oversight and control of the government as obtains in Italy or Belgium, not to say England or France, the war would never have come as it did.

The testimony of Prince Lichnowsky is conclusive as to the guilt of the rulers of Germany, and as to the secrecy with which they carried out their designs. The revelations of August Thyssen and others have shocked the world with the realiza-

tion of the vast power of the military clique in Germany, and the reckless and immoral use they made of it.

There never was, there hardly could be, a system of government more skillfully devised to provide for the absolute rule of a monarchical clique, under the appearance of popular procedure, than the German system, which thrusts forward the Reichstag, with its comparative freedom of debate, and conceals the power of the Bundesrath, that upper house in which fourteen votes are sufficient to block any legislation, and the Kaiser absolutely controls twenty votes. There is much loose talk to the effect that the President of the United States is the "greatest autocrat in the world." Imagine the President empowered to appoint one-third of the members of the Senate, and to direct them as to their voting, when one-fourth of its membership could block any proposed legislation! Talk about "Presidential autocracy" is childish and silly in the face of such comparisons.

Frederick the Great expressed the workings of the Prussian system in his cynical remark, "I and my people have a perfect understanding as to the conduct of affairs; they say what they please, and I do what I please." Such is the government which must be changed radically if the world is

ever to be a safe place for democracy, if Christian internationalism is ever to be achieved.

Democracy is the word which unites the sacredness of the past with the hopes of the future. It is the practical political expression of the faith of the Bible; it is the great essential condition of the hope of future world-peace and world-order, the absolute condition of any lasting internationalism.

There is wonderful significance and inspiration in that scene from the life of the Master in which we see Him led by the tempter to the top of a high mountain, whence He could see all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, and was offered all of them if He would take them by unscrupulous means. When He turned away from that vision and went down to walk among men and win them by appealing to their sense of right and justice and truth, determined to have no authority which did not rest upon their free choice and consent, He was setting an example for all who would govern the people in accordance with the will of God. When the great day of His triumph shall come, and "at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow," it will be the triumph of true democracy no less than of true religion. For the cause of man is the cause of God, and "freedom, equality, fraternity" are watchwords of Christians no less

than of liberals. We are fighting, as our President has said, "to make the world at last free." "If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." For the Christ Who is in every true heart of man is indeed King of Kings and Lord of Lords; and all kings must fall down before Him, all nations must serve Him.

"We knelt before kings; we bent before lords;
For theirs were the crowns, and theirs were the swords:
But the times of the bending and bowing are past,
And the Day of the People is dawning at last.

No more shall the kings, for their glory and gain,
Drive the masses of men to slay and be slain;
For the folly and fury of warfare shall cease
When the Day of the People brings justice and peace.

Great Day of Jehovah! Prophets and seers
Have sung of thy coming, these thousands of years.
On the wings of war's whirlwind God's judgments fly
fast,
And the Day of the People is dawning at last."

CHAPTER VI

AMERICA AND INTERNATIONALISM

ONE great service the war has rendered to this country is to bring America to a full and vivid consciousness of her real meaning and place and duty in the world.

We have been amazed and mightily heartened at the revelation of national strength and unity that has come through the experience of war. Many faced the crisis with dread, fearing lest the diverse elements of which our national life was compounded would fly apart, revealing the weakness of our national fabric. But it has stood, firm and strong and untorn. There is no better example of national unity in the world than our own country. Especially have the grave and natural fears that our citizens of German descent might prove disloyal been dispelled with the advent of war. The great mass of Americans of German ancestry are thoroughly loyal; and the greatest honor is due them for that firm fidelity to the country of their choice which cost them the sacrifice of their loyalty to the country from which they had

82 CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM

come. There is no body of citizens whom we should more delight to honor than the loyal Americans of German lineage.

We have learned much also as to the defects and weak places in our national life. There has been much criticism of the slowness with which our War Department responded to the need, and of the mistakes of the administration. But candid critics must confess that our worst failure has been in that department of our national affairs in which we were surest and proudest of our efficiency,—our industrial and commercial life. The breakdown has been most severe and most costly in transportation, in coördination of business, in meeting the vast needs of coal, food, and other supplies. On the whole the worst failures have been made not by political appointees, but by captains of industry. Those of us who insisted, when the campaign for "Preparedness" was at its height, that the greatest need was industrial and social and spiritual preparedness, and that we could get and equip an army with greater ease and certainty than we could prepare the nation to back up and support the army, feel that our warnings have been justified.

In many another way we have learned truths about our country which we needed to know. But the greatest and most striking effect of the war

upon the national consciousness has been our awakening to such a sense as we have never before known of our right relation to other nations and to the world, of America's international position and responsibilities.

We recall vividly the talk of "Imperialism," and of America as a "World-Power," which marked the days of the war with Spain, twenty years ago. We remember the "Anti-Imperialist" crusade of those days, in which a few very earnest and thoughtful people made a disturbance quite out of proportion to their numbers. That protest against Imperialism was right in motive; for Imperialism must ever be one of the most dangerous and constant foes of a real democracy. But it was quite wrong in method and emphasis, in its conviction that the way to guard America against imperialism was to keep our nation small and at home and out of the main currents of the world's life. The impulse which, in those days, seized the heart of our nation, to go out and play a worthy part in the common political life of the world, was a worthy impulse; to gratify it was honorable; to reject it would have been cowardly.

This war has brought us to a full and deep sense of our world-responsibility. It is hard to realize how far and how fast we have moved in these four years of wartime. At the opening of the

war the people of the United States of America generally viewed it as a quarrel between European nations. We thanked God that it was not our affair, and painfully tried to preserve a thorough-going neutrality. But we came slowly and inevitably to see that it is a struggle exactly in line with the best beliefs, traditions, and ideals of America, and that participation in it is a part of our honorable destiny.

We can never be too thankful for the leader we have had, a man intelligent beyond most as to the past history and present ideals of America, a man with a tendency to err on the side of patience and delay rather than on that of rashness, a mediator who at last led us all to where we saw the conflict from a great moral height, and moved into it unitedly and with gathering power. We easily forget how unready our nation was for action in world affairs in August, 1914. The more facile minds, those better informed as to world politics, have moved so quickly that they forget where they stood and what they judged in the summer of four years ago. Certainly no leader of any prominence urged that we should go to war over the invasion of Belgium. Nothing that Mr. Roosevelt can say to-day avails to alter his article in the *Outlook* in September, 1914, disclaiming American responsibility in the matter. The Monroe

Doctrine, the most sacred article in our political creed, seemed to us to forbid our interference in the affairs of Europe, even as it forbade Europe's intermeddling with affairs on this hemisphere. One may doubt if any leadership less watchful, patient, and high-minded than that of President Wilson would have availed to loose us from our traditional moorings and send us on paths so new and strange, with substantial unity of soul.

But now we see, with crystal vision, that our participation in this war is a natural step forward for America.

Some one has pointed out the fact that our entry into the war is in reality the latest of four great steps forward in the outworking of our democratic destiny.

The first step was taken in 1776 when our fathers adopted their Declaration of Independence. There they laid down certain principles, such as resistance to tyranny, the absolute dependence of governments upon the consent of the governed, the existence of certain inalienable human rights, the obligation on the part of groups of men to show "a decent respect to the opinion of mankind,"—principles which they declared worth dying for, as without them life would not be worth living. It was as if they put a fence about this little strip of territory along the Atlantic seaboard,

and said, "Henceforth liberty and democracy shall live here unmolested. These great principles which underlie and condition happy and just human living shall have the right of way here among these thirteen colonies."

The second step was taken when President James Monroe replied to the threat of the Holy Alliance with the defiant declaration of the Monroe Doctrine. The sign forbidding trespassing was placed all about this Western Hemisphere. The area within which freedom and democracy should have unmolested rights was thus extended to one-half the world.

The third great forward step was taken with the winning of our Civil War. Here two great issues were involved; could a democratic and free government, resting upon the consent of the governed, hold when a supreme strain came, and enforce its rights against rebellious elements within it? And could a theory and practice which nullified the freedom we professed be put down and brought to an end? The outcome has received immortal statement in the Gettysburg Address: "Whether any government so conceived and dedicated can long endure." "That government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The fourth step is our entrance into the present

world-war, the accepted statement of our aim being the oft-quoted phrase, "to make the world safe for democracy." What our fathers did for the thirteen colonies, what America, backed by Britain, did for the Western world, what our great Civil War emphasized and insured, must be done for all men everywhere; their right to a free and just life must be enforced. The relation of the present conflict to America's great heritage could not be better stated than in the words of the President at Mount Vernon, on July 4, 1918:

"A great promise that was meant for all mankind, was here given place and reality. It is significant that Washington and his associates spoke and acted not for a class, but for a people. It has been left for us to see to it that it shall be understood that they spoke and acted, not for a single people only, but for all mankind. We here in America believe our participation in this present war to be only the fruitage of what they planted. We are happy in the thought that we are permitted to do what they would have done had they been in our place. There must now be settled, once for all, what was settled for America in the great age upon whose inspiration we draw to-day. Here were started forces which the great nation against which they were primarily directed at first regarded as a revolt against its rightful authority,

but which it has long since seen to have been a step in the liberation of its own people as well as of the people of the United States; and I stand here now to speak — speak proudly and with confident hope — of the spread of this revolt, this liberation, to the great stage of the world itself! The blinded rulers of Prussia have roused forces they knew little of,— forces which, once roused, can never be crushed to earth again; for they have at their heart an inspiration and a purpose which are deathless, and of the very stuff of triumph.”

We are seeing clearly at last that America is, by birth and by nature, committed to a sane and thorough internationalism. What is America but an experiment, a successful experiment, in international order? Our very flag sets forth the international character of our national life and ideal. It speaks of the possibility of indefinite growth through the federation principle. There stand the thirteen stripes, showing that from which we have grown, and the forty-eight stars, showing that to which we have grown, a harmonious and natural growth, though not lacking its anxious periods, its crises, its mighty conflicts.

Some years ago a German lecturer was speaking of national emblems, and remarked, “The United States of America has no flag.” An American present challenged the statement with the question,

“What about the Stars and Stripes?” The German answered, “That is not a flag; it is a statistic.”

A statistic it may be; but of the growth of democracy. And we know it to be even more a prophecy of the future expansion of world-democracy and world-federation.

The flag speaks also of success in safe-guarding the rights of small states. Each state in the union has its star, and the stars do not differ in glory. It speaks to us of a unity that is not uniformity, of a national life as vivid in its contrasts as are the red, white and blue colors, yet as rich and wonderful a unity as is the flag. And who can look upon the stars in the blue field, noblest emblem ever taken by any nation, no beast or bird or crown or weapon, but a bit of God's sky — and not see there a reminder that earth shall come to peace and righteousness and joy when the nations move in harmony as the stars move in their orbits, and the will of God is “done on earth as it is done in the heavens”?

It is not too much to say that the only real and serious issue between America and Germany in the present war has been the issue of internationalism. Other issues lie between Germany and France, between Germany and Britain, between Austria and Italy, between Germany and Russia. But this is

the only issue between Germany and America. All we seek from the war is an international order of justice, goodwill, and lasting peace. We are in the war because America believes in such an order, and Germany does not; because we always have believed in it, and she never has. The record is clear. Every time an attempt has been made to limit armaments, to restrict the savagery of war, to bring about some larger measure of international order, at Hague Conferences and the like, America has gone to the extreme of willingness and eagerness; and almost every time the effort has failed of its aim because Germany refused to advance, or to modify in any respect her theories or practices. Throughout her history America has, on the whole, respected international law and agreement, and Germany has not. America has pushed international treaties of arbitration, now having them between herself and twenty-nine other nations; Germany has scorned them. We need not, and must not, claim a guiltless record. We are not wholly proud of our Mexican War, nor of all our dealings with Oriental nations, nor of the way we got the canal at Panama. But on the whole we have stood before the world a nation that obviously wanted to live with other nations as a Christian gentleman wants to live with his neighbors; we have stood for the principles on

which the peace of the world would justly and securely rest. We went into Cuba, declaring that we would come out. Few among the nations believed we would keep our word; but we did. We took the Philippines from Spain, but we paid the defeated nation \$20,000,000. How many other cases are there in history where the conqueror paid an indemnity to the conquered? And we have so far administered the Philippines in the interests of the inhabitants, and not for the advantage of the United States. We paid back to China one-half the indemnity asked after the Boxer Rebellion. We stood for the righteous principle of the "Open Door" in China, when no other nation would take that stand. The course of the present administration in Mexico may have been marred by blunders; at least it has been marked by extreme patience and reluctance to threaten or dominate. As has been wittily said, "Our course in Mexico may have been a mess; but, thank God, it has not been a mess of pottage." Our very reluctance to enter this war is proof that we have "the international mind," that will not break the peace until compelled by irresistible demands of conscience.

Set America's dealings with Cuba and Mexico over against Austria's dealings with Serbia; set America's dealings with Spain over against Ger-

many's dealings with France in 1871; set America's handling of the Philippines over against Germany's handling of Alsace, or Poland, or her African colonies; set America's conduct in China over against Germany's seizure of Kiao-Chau, her "punitive expedition" under Count von Waldersee, her spirit as revealed in the Kaiser's speech to the troops as they started for China; could two nations be further apart in their sense of international justice and goodwill and order?

And our President has expressed the heart-desire of America as a whole when he declares that we are in this war in order that out of it may come a "League of Free Nations," pledged to keep the peace by administering justice. We would be false to our best heritage of action and ideal if we fought for any less an end.

There are two warnings we should take to heart with utmost seriousness.

One of them is that we must face our special problems in a spirit broadly fair and international. We must shape our relations with Mexico, with Latin America, with China and Japan, in a spirit of true and full Christian internationalism, seeking no selfish advantage, determined to do as we would be done by, asking not what we have the power to do, nor what is to our interest to do, nor even what we have the right to do, but what our international

duty may be, how we may best insure justice and goodwill in increasing measure throughout our relations with these nations that touch us most nearly, and that watch us with that jealous care inevitable when one knows that another is stronger than himself and is not quite sure that he is just and generous. We must fear to inflict injury even more than to suffer it; we must covet the respect paid to just and generous character even more than the respect yielded to obvious power; we must be, in all our relations, conspicuous for that Christian internationalism for which we have fought against Germany.

The second warning is that we citizens of America must look forward and not back. We have set our hand to the plow. To look back is to prove ourselves unfit for the Kingdom. To fail to go to the end of the furrow is to be unworthy of our past heritage and of our present position. There is danger that, when the war is over, we shall be content to lapse into our isolation again, shall make a fetich of Washington's warning against "entangling alliances," shall be content to make America great and forget to make America the great servant of mankind. We must see that our entrance into this war is not a mere crusade, but the beginning of a new life, of world-wide responsibility, of unrestricted fellowship with all men and all na-

tions. Historians tell us that the turning-point of the Revolutionary struggle was the battle of Kings' Mountain, where the farmers and backwoodsmen of the Carolinas gathered and defeated the British army which was threatening the regular American forces. But after that battle, the men who had won it went home again, leaving Washington and his men to fight the rest of the war unaided. Our participation in this war must be no Kings' Mountain affair, turning-point of the war though it may be, after which we shall come home and let the world go on as it will, without care on our part. It must be rather the beginning of the deep devotion of all we are here in America to the good of the whole world. Our motto may well be the great words, "America asks nothing for herself that she does not claim for all mankind." We are in the war for no local issue, but for the great cause of a free, ordered, righteous internationalism. And we say, as Lincoln said in 1863, "We accepted this war; we did not begin it. We accepted it for a purpose, and when that purpose is achieved, the war will end. And I pray God it may never end until that purpose is achieved."

CHAPTER VII

CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS FOR AN INTERNATIONAL ORDER

IN Kant's classic pamphlet, "Zum Evigen Frieden," he notes clearly three essential conditions of enduring peace. One of them is the provision of adequate legal machinery whereby judicial process may readily take the place of war.

There is no hope of lasting peace until such an international order is established. Nations will not cease from war until a better way of securing their rights is made clear and safe for them. The weakness of international law up to the present time has been in the fact that there was no force back of it; it rested only upon the mutual consent of the nations, and the international order secured by it was ever at the mercy of any unscrupulous power. Suppose our common, civil law were formulated only as men cared to enter into agreements and contracts with reference to specific matters, and were left unenforced save by the honor or interest of the individual. Society would be in a state which no one but an anarchist would count

desirable, and which even the anarchist would find intolerable, were the theory put into practice. Yet such is the actual condition of the relations between states.

The serious problem confronting the world just now is well stated in a paragraph from "The War and Democracy"¹;—"Can Inter-State Law, hitherto a mere shadow of the majestic name it bears, almost a matter of convention and etiquette, with no permanent tribunal to interpret it, and no government to enforce it, be enthroned with the necessary powers to maintain justice between the peoples and governments of the world?"

That is altogether the biggest question affecting the future of the human race just now. Upon the faith or the unbelief, the courage or the faint-heartedness, in which we deal with it will depend the welfare of the race for all the generations to come.

It is not strange then that strong and resolute minds are attempting to deal with this problem constructively, and daring to put forth programs more or less detailed. The wisest among them does not dare to assert that he has found the perfect solution of the problem, or even that the solution he proposes is practicable. But he does not

¹ "The War and Democracy," by Alfred E. Zimmern, page 374.

hesitate to put forward his constructive suggestion, that out of the clash of many minds light may come as to the best and most workable program.

Mankind has ever been haunted by dreams of universal peace, of international justice and goodwill, of a day when war should have faded like a night-mare, and men should live in freedom and comfort.

A certain measure of internationalism there has always been, for no state can quite live to itself. Alliances have been sought, states have formed groups; but always for specific occasions and ends, usually for defense or offense in war. There are in Greek history germs of the international idea, certain Leagues of Cities which had as one great end of their existence the preservation of peace, or the enforcement of certain principles of public right. The most celebrated of these was the Amphictyonic Council, to maintain the general interests of Greece, and particularly to defend the sanctity of the common shrine at Delphi. One of the most interesting chapters in ancient history is the story of how the other states of Greece united to punish Athens for her violation of the sanctity of the shrine which all had united to guarantee.

The Hebrew, most farseeing and deep-seeing of all the ancient races, had dreams and visions of a wider and nobler sort. He saw the problem of

war and peace solved by the setting of law in place of war. His dream was often confused and tainted with what we may call a Hebrew imperialism, a conviction that the world would never be right and safe until his own race was set securely as arbiter of the destinies of the world, the Messianic King of Israel ruling over all nations with a rod of iron. But always down at the heart of his dreams and visions of future righteousness and peace was the sound kernel of thought that righteousness, expressed in law, and enforced by God's agents, would solve the problem and bring lasting peace to mankind.

A great vision meets us in the writings of two of the earliest prophets, Isaiah and Micah. Its appearance in each of these books may indicate not that either borrowed it from the other, but that both of them caught it up from some earlier source. Perhaps it was a popular song which they seized and made lasting. It shows us the nations beating their weapons of war into implements of agriculture, not needing war, nor learning it, any more; because law has taken the place of war, law going forth from the throne of God in Jerusalem, and establishing and maintaining justice and peace throughout the world.¹

Far more significant is the great passage which

¹ Isaiah 2:1-5. Micah 4:1-5.

deals with the international mission of the Servant of the Lord, found in the 42nd Chapter of the Book of Isaiah. We need to emphasize the fact that the hero of Israel is here shown not as a King or War-Lord, but as a Servant, servant of God and servant of humanity. He is to "send forth judgment unto victory." He is to be very tender of little groups and tiny influences and small beginnings: "The bruised reed will he not break, and the dimly-burning wick will he not quench." But equally plain and sure is his indomitableness. "He shall not himself be bruised or burn dimly till he have set judgment in the earth." That word "judgment," "mishpat," is a word of great significance. It means justice both in spirit and in form, justice as an abstract principle, and justice as an enforced program. It is a magnificent prophecy, this of the Servant of God securing peace and joy for humanity through establishing an international order whereby justice may be administered and peace thus may be kept on firm foundations.

But for many centuries men have been under the glamour of the rule of Rome. Imperialism has seemed to them the only possible international order. Church and state have united to foster that idea. No one who is intelligent about the history of Europe can doubt the im-

mense influence which the imperial tradition has had on the development of Prussia and Austria. Hapsburg and Hohenzollern count themselves heirs of Rome through Charlemagne and the Germanic emperors. Napoleon felt himself in spirit and destiny the successor of the Roman Emperors, who made the world one by subjugation. The British have talked much of the "empire"; the Imperialist has held sway often in their councils. One of the most wholesome reactions of the war upon current political life is the growing strength and outspokenness of the dislike for the term "empire," on the part of colonials, and of many English and Scotch, and of the desire for some better name, such as "commonwealth," to be the proper designation of such a union of democratic states as that commonly known as the British Empire. There is too much of the flavor of military autocracy about the words "empire" and "imperial."

Overshadowed by this imperial idea of world-unity, the minds of men lost the true sense of an international order firm yet free. But as the democratic impulse quickened to new life during the 19th century, as the minds of men were set free more and more from age-long obsessions, again they began to dream of world-peace secured by

world-order; and increasingly the dreams took shape in the suggestion of a League of Nations to enforce peace.

It was just about at the time that Kant published his great little tract on "Enduring Peace," that Thomas Paine seriously proposed that England, France, and the United States should form a permanent alliance in order to the preservation of the peace of the world. Some years later, at the close of the Napoleonic era Castlereagh went to the Council of Vienna resolved to attempt the formation of a league of nations to preserve the peace. The scheme fell into the hands of the autocrats, and became distorted into the monstrosity known as the Holy Alliance, a league of kings against the people. In 1913, shortly before his assassination, Jaurès, attempting to forestall the storm of war which he dimly foresaw, proposed a league to be composed of France, Great Britain, and Germany, pledged to maintain the peace of Europe.

The close of the 19th century and the opening of the 20th were marked by great growth of the idea of a league of nations to preserve peace. The first concrete proposition to that effect seems to have been made by Andrew Carnegie in his rectorial address at St. Andrew's, in which he urged that, as nations have joined in alliances for pur-

poses of war, so they should join in an alliance to preserve the peace, to guarantee it jointly. Great public interest was aroused, and a mighty impetus given to the movement, by the Nobel Prize address which Theodore Roosevelt delivered at Christiania, May 5, 1910, in which he urged the practicability and necessity of such a league in which nations should join, pledged jointly to keep the peace among themselves and to prevent the breach of it by others. It is extraordinary that Mr. Roosevelt is now one of the very few leaders of American thought and action who speak slightly of the idea of a league of nations, or "damn it with faint praise," having suffered a violent reaction to that nationalistic temper which he rightly saw, in the less passionate times of eight years ago, to be one of the chief dangers of the world's life. Mr. Roosevelt's reaction from a sane internationalism to a violent nationalism, and from ardent progressive ideals to marked conservative tendencies is one of the strangest and most deplorable instances of deterioration and lost leadership to be found in American political life, comparable to the moral weakening of Daniel Webster which led Whittier to write his lament "Ichabod," or the hardening of Wordsworth's mind and heart which made Browning break forth in the passionate protest of "The Lost Leader."

The two conferences at The Hague furthered the idea of international order. Called originally to discuss the matter of possible reduction of armament, these conferences came quickly to the matter of the establishment of courts of arbitral justice, and some form of world-organization. For it was clearly seen, so soon as men gave real thought to the matter, that war could not be gotten rid of by direct attack, but only by providing a reasonable and practicable substitute for its cruel and crude, wasteful and unjust, method of settling disputes between states. Disarmament must always wait on the prior establishment of firm and trustworthy means of administering international justice and law.

The Hague Conferences closed with but little result, on account of three causes; the mutual jealousies of great powers; the difficulty of finding a satisfying place in an international order for the small states; and the steadfast opposition of Germany to any practical suggestions looking toward disarmament, or international organization.

But, under the stress of war conditions, a vast impetus has been given to the thinking of men about international problems. They have come to see clearly that some sort of world-unity is essential to a free and wholesome life for humanity; and that only three ways to the achievement of

such unity can be discerned, the way of Imperialism, the way of the Balance of Power, and the way of a real Federative Internationalism.

There is general realization of the fact that Imperialism, even if any one nation could achieve it, would be an unspeakable calamity to the race. The best men in France, England, and America would rather see their nations perish utterly in blood and fire than live under the imperial rule of Prussia. It is quite certain that there are many in Germany itself,—more perhaps than any of us believe,—who see the dangers of imperialism clearly, and oppose it vigorously.

Under the clear and forceful reasoning of President Wilson, and under the greater power of the facts of the time, we are coming to see with increasing clarity that the preservation of peace and order by the play of the Balance of Power is no longer possible or desirable. Great Britain played that game for many years with great skill, and, on the whole, with pacific and disinterested motives. But the Balance of Power will not secure justice and peace in the new era of which this war marks the beginning.

Clearly the time has come for a new international order, for the last and greatest step in the organization of human life, which has proceeded from the family to the clan, the city, the state; and

now must go on to some sort of organization of the world of mankind. Aristotle said that there could not be a free state with more than 100,000 inhabitants. But the discovery of the two principles of representative government and of federation have made possible the development of vast political organizations of human life, of which the most impressive illustrations are Switzerland, the United States of America, and, most striking of all, the British Empire.

The war itself has set before the eyes of men an amazing demonstration of the possibility of international coöperation in the actual working force of the British Commonwealth. We see, not in theory, but in concrete demonstration under crucial conditions, the working of a higher patriotism, a loftier and more inclusive loyalty, of exactly the sort that is needed to make any international order firm and successful. Australians, New Zealanders, Canadians, South Africans, each group dominated by a strong local patriotism, each separate colony or dominion a self-governing entity, have been revealed as organized into a commonwealth which holds when the strain comes. Here is a state, an international order, which embraces one-quarter of the human race; and, as has been well said, "These men and nations have come from all the ends of the earth to preserve a union

of democracies. They have shown by example what any World League most needs to know, that federalism on a grand scale is not an idle dream."

Out of the thinking of many men, under the stress of war, have come definite proposals for an International Order, a League of Nations, constructive proposals to which the leading statesmen of the world have given their strong support and loyalty. The most concrete, and in many ways the most promising, scheme yet set forth is that of the League to Enforce Peace, organized in Philadelphia in the spring of 1915.

Its program embraces four propositions:

1. That all justiciable questions arising between the nations composing the league (i.e. all questions susceptible of solution on a basis of actual fact or of clearly recognized international law) shall be submitted to a permanent Court of Justice.

2. That all non-justiciable questions shall be laid before special Councils of Conciliation or Arbitration.

The nations forming the league agree not to proceed to hostilities in any case until the dispute shall have been submitted in one of these ways, and the judgment of the body to which it has been referred shall have been announced, allowing a reasonably restricted time for the rendering of the judgment of the court.

3. The nations composing the League agree to use jointly their forces, economic and military, against any member of the League which shall begin hostilities without first submitting the case for judgment.

4. Steps are to be taken to provide means for the codification, formulation, and development, of international law, from time to time.

Criticisms of this scheme have been abundant. Some urge that it goes too far; others that it does not go far enough. The latter point to the fact that no provision is made to govern the case of a breach of the peace by an outsider. The answer is two-fold; first that such a league would ultimately, and in all probability very quickly, take in all the great nations; and second, that doubtless the nations composing the League would enter into agreement as to their dealings with outside nations or groups, but that these matters may wisely be left to the developments of future policy.

Those who criticize the program of the League to Enforce Peace as going too far declare that it demands a yielding of sovereignty to which no great nation would consent. The answer is that no real international order can be established which does not involve some limitation of irresponsible nationalism. In fact such limitation is precisely one of the aims of the League, and such

irresponsible nationalism one of the dangers it aims to avert or reduce. The words of Professor Gilbert Murray have the essence of wisdom in them:—"The chief counsel of wisdom here is to be sure to go far enough. Outvoted minorities must accustom themselves to giving way."

Such a scheme as this would insure two inestimable factors of peace-preservation, delay and publicity, with a clear foreknowledge on the part of every peace-breaker of the results of his action.

There are difficulties in the way of such a program, very serious ones. We shall attempt to state and meet some of them in a succeeding chapter. But at least it is a way out of the present anarchy, which has become clearly intolerable.

Viscount Grey has recently said that had such a League to Enforce Peace been in existence in the summer of 1914, there would have been no war. His final note to the Berlin government, imploring delay in the interest of the preservation of the peace, pledged his most earnest efforts to bring about some such international understanding, by which Germany might have her rightful future insured against attack by any of her neighbors or any coalition of nations.

Consider what would have been the course of events, had such a League of Nations been work-

ing effectively in the troubled days and weeks of early summer in 1914. Austria's demands contained in the ultimatum to Serbia would, as a matter of course, have been submitted to the Court at The Hague, or, had the matter been deemed non-justiciable, to a special council of conciliation. Pending the verdict of such court or council, Austria would have been under bonds of honor not to open hostilities. Had she insisted on taking her own course, regardless of her solemn pledges, she would have found the other great powers at once ranged against her. Can any one seriously believe that the attack on Serbia would have taken place under such conditions?

"But," the critic will urge, "can any one seriously believe, on the other hand, that Germany would have kept her promise as a member of the League of Nations? Would she not at once have repudiated her international obligations and ranged herself on the side of Austria? And would not the result therefore have been exactly the same, whether or no a League of Nations had existed in 1914?" Undoubtedly Germany would have been ready to stand by Austria, whatever became of her international agreements. But the situation would have been vitally different in two immensely important particulars:—The first is that the aggressive character of the war would

have been instantly and unmistakably clear to the people of Germany and Austria, as well as to the whole world. We would have heard no seductive and confusing statements about "this war which was forced upon us." An immense element of strength would thus have been taken from the Teutonic aggressors. The second difference is that the war would have been begun with a clear realization on the part of the Central Powers that not only France and Russia, but Great Britain, Italy, and the United States, not to mention less powerful nations, would instantly have been ranged against them. No one who has studied with any care the events of the opening days of the war can doubt that Germany and Austria would have hesitated and very likely would have consented to some of the measures of conciliation proposed by the British Foreign Secretary, had they known beyond a doubt that England would enter the war, if Germany began it. In view of these facts, it is not too strong a statement which Viscount Grey has made, that had such a League been in existence in 1914, the war would not have come.

In considering the proposed scheme of the League to Enforce Peace, earnest attention should be paid to the fourth provision. It is deserving of special emphasis. No League of Nations can be strong and lasting if it lack this provision. A

league organized merely to preserve in fixed and unchangeable form the status quo of the peace settlement would in time become an instrument of injustice. For nations grow and decay; problems and conditions change; there must be a certain measure of elasticity about any agreements into which the nations enter, with reasonable provision for discussion with a view to alteration of treaties, understandings, and the like.

No one, not even the most ardent partisan, believes that any scheme proposed is perfect, or even that any can serve as a model of the desired international order without radical modifications. But some such international organization is the one hope of the world. The choice confronting us has been graphically expressed by Mr. H. G. Wells: "The choice is between a league of free nations, and a lot of freebooting nations, looting, amid the ruins of a burning world, for non-existent food." We do not want a Prussianized world, efficient, powerful, ordered, but subservient and cowed. We do not want a Russianized world, free, but chaotic, disorganized, wild, a prey to the strong. We want a world where free nations live together and work together as the Entente nations and America are now living and working, a world free and ordered, "the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed, and sustained by the

organized opinion of mankind." ¹ That amounts to saying that what we want to see, what we must see, if human life is to be decent and safe and happy, is a League of free nations pledged to keep the peace by the efficient and prompt administration of international justice.

¹ President Wilson; speech at Mt. Vernon, July 4, 1918.

CHAPTER VIII

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING INTERNATIONALISM

A SERIOUS mistake, common among peace-loving and internationally-minded folk in the days before the war, was that of facing the task of international organization with an easy optimism. We believed in the reasonableness of human nature. We did not appreciate how unreasonable men are, or how tenacious are the roots of old prejudices and passions and points of view. If the war has rendered no other service, at least it has opened our eyes to the serious nature of the task confronting forward-looking men, has aroused in us a wholesome conviction that no progress can be made toward a lasting peace without a frank and resolute facing of the difficulties in the way.

A League of Free Nations will never come into existence simply by virtue of the fact that good men want it, and admire it, and talk about it in elevated language. It will come only by long, hard work, so determined and skillful that it will be able to clear away the stubborn obstacles, and

give the great world-ideal free course. It may be well at this point then to set before ourselves some of the major difficulties which must be faced and overcome. We may not be able as yet to discern practical ways of meeting them, but it will be of some service to recognize them clearly.

These difficulties are well grouped and concisely expressed in a recent article by Mr. H. N. Brailsford:

“It is well that we should remind ourselves energetically that the idea of a League of Nations, familiar though the phrase now is, is still a novel and speculative conception, capable of many definitions. Is it merely a treaty of arbitration, or is it a first step towards the federal government of the world? Will it rely on national armies, or will it attempt (surely too hazardous a feat) to construct, as Mr. Wells advocates, an international police? Will it ignore the economic relations of states, as the two propagandist societies in America and England seem to assume, or must it on the contrary be built on the control of the world's raw materials, shipping and markets? Will it leave the seas to the control of the strongest navy, as I suppose nine Englishmen in ten assume, or will the League itself, as the French Socialists phrase it, become “the mistress of the seas”? Will it be a mere league of governments, or shall we begin

to build up, at an early stage, some structure of representative and democratic control? Does disarmament mean small professional armies, or does it mean national militias? Will it tolerate on any terms defensive alliances among its members? Finally, we must face the biggest question of all. Is the League a close conservative structure, built to secure a precarious security by maintaining forever the status quo of the war settlement, or is it, on the contrary, an organization which will take growth and ambition into account, and aim at compassing by peaceful means the largest changes as changes become due? None of these questions have yet been faced, even among ourselves. Few of them have been discussed even in books or pamphlets. None of them has been settled by public opinion."

Obviously, to form a successful and strong League of Nations will be no easy matter of "doing for the world what our fathers did for America." Even were the task no more serious and intricate than that, we would do well to remember how near our fathers came to failure in framing a constitutional government for the thirteen colonies. We recall Franklin's request for prayer, all other hope having failed. We remember his final words, in which he said that often, looking at the sun pictured on the head of the chair of the

presiding officer, he had wondered whether it were a rising or a setting sun. It was no light task to organize a government that should command the respect and loyalty of thirteen separate states. It is a task vastly more difficult to make any real and valuable and promising world-organization.

For such a league must be far more than a means of preserving the status quo of the peace settlement. Some of the problems it must meet successfully are the following:

1. It must meet the problems created by the fact that human society is continually in flux, and that therefore nations grow, decay, expand, change. Rigidity, the assumption that any settlement whatever can last unchanged through many years, will make failure inevitable. In some way treaties, and international laws and agreements, must be susceptible of adjustment to meet new conditions. It is intolerable that a growing world should be bound by unyielding bands.

No scheme or device for an international order can long avail which goes no further than the effective enforcement of existing treaties and understandings. Sooner or later,— and not too late,— we must come to something analogous to our Supreme Court in the United States, with power to interpret, adapt, and legally develop existing laws and agreements, to meet the changing needs

of an ever-growing world. Here we confront an immense and intricate problem. How long would our government have endured, had not the Constitution been given elasticity by the living decisions and interpretations of the Courts? An international order consisting of nothing more than a court to try cases of breach of existing law would hardly last while being set up.

2. A second serious problem is *the problem of the small state*. This is two-fold.

Can small states join in a League to Enforce Peace? Could they reasonably and with security for themselves give their pledge to turn their forces instantly against an aggressor, as the League program demands that every signatory shall do? Suppose a war to arise similar to the present struggle, while the League is in existence. Could Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, at once open hostilities toward Germany, and not meet the fate which Serbia and Belgium met in 1914? Clearly participation for the small state must be on a basis somewhat different from that which holds for a great power.

On the other hand what representation can a small state rightly expect in the councils and courts of the international government? Fine phrases are heard about the "equal rights of all nations, small and great." How can those rights be rec-

ognized in any scheme of international order? It was necessary, in the formation of our Federal Government, to provide two houses, in one of which the great states have proportionate power, while in the other all the states, great and small, sit as equals. Can some such scheme be devised for the world-government? The Senate of the United States has not proved altogether and always a dependable and valuable part of our governing machinery; there, more than anywhere else, the intrigues of vested interests find their nests. On the vaster plane of international government, with the immensely greater interests involved, with the far more subtle and jealous and powerful play of separatist tendencies, and group politics, how can the balance be secured wherein neither the small state nor the great power shall be at the mercy of the other? We must bear in mind that one of the rocks on which the fair-going split at the Hague Conferences was the insistence of lesser states on the principle of equal representation. Any practicable and successful scheme for an international order would seem to demand great and generous confidence on the part of small states and great states, each toward the other. And no one has as yet suggested the device which will meet this tremendously practical and determinative problem.

3. A third problem is the problem of *adminis-*

tration. Not long ago the idea had widespread acceptance that the way to permanent order was through the abandonment of national armaments and the creation and maintenance of an international police. But the difficulties confronting such a scheme are wellnigh insurmountable. The constitution of such an international force, the chances for corruption, for underhanded efforts to secure control of it in the interests of some one nation or group of nations, the temptations to unscrupulous world-politics in the naming of the commander of the force, and the like, these are dangers formidable and sinister. Attempts to create an international police force, as in the case of the expedition to rescue the legations in Peking during the Boxer troubles, do not offer much encouragement. We do not want to be involved in any more appointments like that of von Waldersee, or any more united expeditions like that in which the Kaiser sent his troops out with orders to play the part of Huns in China.

Propositions are being made to meet this difficulty. A graded scale of armament is proposed for all nations, or a graded scale of expenditure on armament, or international control of the manufacture and sale of munitions. Some solution must be found, or the international government will have slight power and permanence.

4. Even more serious is the problem of sanctions. How can there be provided sanctions so powerful in their appeal that they will bind the nations strongly to the international organization?

Some two years ago there appeared an article by L. P. Jacks, in the *Hibbert Journal*, in which he dealt most acutely with this particular problem. He pointed out the obvious fact that one of the forces operating most powerfully hitherto in the way of holding citizens and groups and divisions within a nation to an unwavering loyalty to the national authority has been the fear of other nations. He then raised the serious question, whether an international organization, a world-government, could hold together when, by its very existence, that pressure of the fear of other governments was removed. The question is so grave that we can scarcely wonder that it reduced the writer to the despairing conclusion that "a league of nations may be the only hope of the world, but there is no hope of that."

Some way or ways must be discovered by which the international organization may be set before the nations as so big, and important, and commanding, and indispensable to vital interests, that it will inevitably command their unwavering loyalty. The economic interests of the nations must somehow be tied up with the success of the league

of nations. It must be made economically very advantageous to any nation to "come in and play fair." There must be men to do what Hamilton did in 1789, show the powerful states that to join the union of states will work to their economic profit and to stay out to their economic loss. Some have proposed that large international credits be established, huge deposits made by the great nations, which will be forfeited when any nation breaks the peace, "bonds to keep the peace" on an immense scale.

Here we find the legitimate defense for the threat of continued economic discrimination against an unrepentant and unreformed Germany. The original "Paris Declaration" was seriously defective. It smacked of vengeance, and, worse still, of a hidden eagerness to take advantage of the war to weaken Germany's legitimate commercial aspirations. The effort being made at present to enroll men and women here in the United States in an organization each member of which pledges himself never again, so long as he lives, consciously to buy any article made in Germany, is false, foolish, dangerous, and immoral. We have no right so to forecast and discount and bind the future years. Any decent man or woman must hope that Germany will speedily come to such a change of heart and mind that intercourse with her will be-

come safe and honorable again, and must leave the way open for such a course, even though the grounds for such a hope seem very shadowy and uncertain.

But on the other hand the action of the Union of British Seamen in announcing a boycott of German trade, the length and severity of which will depend on the German conduct of the war, is the use of a fair and honorable weapon; and President Wilson's warning that we cannot contemplate free economic relations with a Germany still autocratic and dominated with the imperialistic ideal is an indication of a legitimate and effective method of securing the allegiance of powerful states to the proposed League of Nations.

But other sanctions than the economic must be worked out. In some way the imagination must be aroused and the international order made to appeal not merely to cool reason, but to heart loyalty. We must find something which will do for the international organization what the flag does for the nation, symbolize and make concrete a great object of reverence and loyalty.

5. The problem of economic relations is a serious one in itself, quite apart from its relation to the sanctions needed by the international order. It may not be possible to trace all wars to economic causes, but no other one source can so readily claim

that doubtful honor. Is not this war, at heart, a conflict not about Alsace or Trieste, but about the control of Africa, China, Mesopotamia, Russia, the great backward, unexploited territories of the world? It is not too much to say that "just as the chief task of American politics to the Civil War was the organization of the unexploited West, so the chief task of world diplomacy to-day is the organization of virgin territory and backward peoples." ¹

The peace of the world will be unstable just so long as individuals or groups can go into backward countries, obtain concessions, make investments, develop vast private interests, and depend on the home government to enforce their claims and defend their interests. Under such conditions every undeveloped country, where are to be found rich resources and a defective political and social order, becomes a breeding-place of wars.

Somehow the international order, if it is to be powerful and permanent, must deal with this problem. Shall national backing of individual investors be henceforth outlawed? Shall industrial groups take their own risk? Shall international commissions or syndicates be formed to see fair play, and to adjust rival claims? Certainly that proposition has in it an added advantage, in that

¹ "The Stakes of Diplomacy"; Walter Lippmann.

it would enhance the prestige of the international government, by giving to it real and great powers. Shall an International Bank be set up, from which, and from which alone, nations needing funds for their development may obtain credits, subject to careful oversight by an international commission?

Here is a group of problems to be met and solved, before we can hope for a real and lasting League of Nations.

6. We are also confronted with the problems connected with the peace settlement of the present war. Can such a settlement be arranged that sore places shall be healed, the roots of future wars eradicated, and the life of small nations assured? Shall Germany be admitted to the League of Nations, and, if so, on what terms and how soon?

These are but samples of the vast problems confronting any attempt at the establishment of an international order. The attempt bristles with difficulties on every side, so many and so great that we might well call the task hopeless, were it not so imperative.

In what spirit shall we face these problems and difficulties? Two ways lie open to us.

The first is the spirit of hopelessness. We may look at all these problems, taking them, as we should, in their full seriousness, and say that they leave no room for hope, that the idea of a League

of Nations to Enforce Peace is Utopian, the dream of poets and prophets, very beautiful but wholly impossible.

Many there be who will thus say, "Who will show us any good?" There are large and strong groups who will urge that we relapse into the old anarchy, counting the proposals for a real international order as baseless dreams. There is the group of the temperamentally hard-headed,—wooden-headed would be the better term,—all the sluggish, the reactionaries, the materialists, the naturally unbelieving, who ever interpret life in its lowest terms. There are the many whose private or class advantage lies in maintaining unchanged the present system of industry and politics, and who note how intimately the new system of internationalism is associated with social and political reform. There are the irreconcilable nationalists, who exalt local patriotism into a supreme religion, and resent any attempt at the establishment of an international order as involving the weakening of patriotism. There are all the militarists, who count war inevitable, and good, and believe that no great question is settled until it has been fought out in battle. This makes a mighty army to support the cause of hopelessness, to impede the progress of a sane and real international order. It will be hard to overcome such forces.

But another spirit is possible, and it is the only spirit in which the work can be done. It is the spirit of faith, of determined resolve. We may well remind ourselves, and all men, of the alternative to the establishment of a League of Nations. That alternative is set forth strongly in the opening pages of G. Lowes Dickinson's book, "The Choice Before Us." The war has made palpable to us the fact that no one nation can safely live unarmed while other nations prepare for war, that, in fact, a single nation that arms sets the pace for all the world. The only hope for relief from the burden of competitive armament, inevitably leading to future wars, is through the organization of a League of Nations to guarantee peace and justice to all peoples. What will it mean if failure to set up such an international order condemns the nations, already burdened with the colossal debts of the war, and the vast demands for reconstruction, to arm as never in the past, to put all their energies into the insane competition which will grow the more keen and insatiable as Russia and China enter it with their vast resources? That way lies ruin, inevitable and complete. To keep up the policy of armaments will mean also that the scientists and inventors, needed so desperately for leadership in tasks of reconstruction, will be devoting their energies to the discovery and

development of new means of destruction. Huxley said that Pasteur, by his discoveries in sheep-culture and silk-culture, saved France a larger amount than the huge indemnity she had to pay to Prussia in 1871. What a loss if future Pasteurs must bend all their energies to the devilish work of making bacteriology available in "the next war"!

It will hearten us for the difficult task to see thus clearly the alternative to the establishment of a League of Nations to Enforce Peace. The scheme may be Utopian, but it is mere good sense to say, "as between Utopia and Hell, give me Utopia,"—a remark—strange to say—credited to both David Starr Jordan and Theodore Roosevelt!

We do well to remind ourselves also, for our encouragement, of the strong men and groups who do not count the establishment of a League of Nations an impossibility, but have pledged it their hearty and full allegiance. The men in whose hands now rest the destinies of the world are fully committed to the idea. President Wilson has given it central place in wellnigh every address. Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Asquith, Viscount Grey,—it is hard to name a leader of thought and action in Great Britain who is not committed to a League of Nations. The British Labor Party, in its strong and arresting statement

of its war aims, made the establishment of a League of Nations second only to restoration and reparation toward Belgium. The American Federation of Labor set the League of Nations among the indispensable aims and objects of the war. Equally emphatic has been the endorsement of Chambers of Commerce and business leaders generally. The tides of thought and feeling set strongly that way just now. "They that be with us are more than they that be with them." It is a time to be courageous and hopeful.

But, regardless of numbers and signs and favoring winds and tides, this is a task to be faced in the spirit of invincible faith and resoluteness. We should find in every difficulty a challenge and an appeal. When men say that the scheme is impracticable, let Lord Robert Cecil give his extraordinary reply, "Practical men never accomplish anything." What is the history of human progress but the record of the doing of what men said could not be done? The advance of man has been the continual confounding of cold reason and prudence, the continual achievement of that which had been dubbed impossible. Human sacrifice had to go, slavery had to go, prohibition of intoxicants is coming, because men went on to do what the mass of men said could not be done. Why, when one of us would voice impossibility, he in-

stinctively says, "I could no more do that than I could fly"; and even as he says it he may hear overhead the snarl of a propeller, reminding him how the Wrights did that for believing in which Langley was called a fool.

At least let us have faith that the coming Peace Conference can be radically different from those of the past. Two fatal defects they have had; they were limited to the nations engaged as belligerents; and they dissolved after devising a settlement, with no provision for its enforcement, still less for its interpretation and adaptation. It is plainly possible to hold together the coming Peace Conference, as the nucleus of an international order, and to recognize in it the right of all nations to be considered. Indeed that part of the problem is almost solved, for almost all the world is in the war.

The establishment of a sane and real international order is one of those tasks for which faith alone is adequate. Christian men should feel the challenge and the appeal to them. Christians are in the world in order to do the things which unbelievers say cannot be done. They follow a Master Who said that if they had faith, "Nothing should be impossible."

When men look at anything great and good and desirable, and say, as Mr. Jacks said of the League

of Nations idea, that it is the only hope of the world, but is itself almost hopeless; then the men of faith should rise and, in the might that comes from God, do the thing that should be done, knowing that that which should be, can be, and resolved that, by the grace of God, it shall be.

“ O why and for what are we waiting, while our brethren
 droop and die,
And on every wind of the heavens a wasted life goes by?
Come then, since all things call us, the living and the
 dead,
And o’er the weltering tangle a glimmering light is shed;
Ah, come, cast off all fooling, for this at least we
 know: —
That the dawn and the day are coming, and forth the
 banners go.”

CHAPTER IX

CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING INTERNATIONALISM

It is of the greatest importance that we see this cause of Internationalism not merely as a wise and prudent enterprise, an expedient move, or a bit of far-visioned wisdom; but that we see it as a holy cause, with the sanction of God and of faith and of religion.

We should see the war in that way. There has been much talk about this as a holy war. But if we are to have even the slightest justification for such language, we must see the war as something more than an attempt to whip Germany, or to punish Germany, or to restrain Germany; we cannot count it a holy war, or even a decent war, until we see it as the inevitable way toward something God wants, something which, so far as we see, can come now in no other way, something so great and valuable that the gaining of it is worth our wading through blood and fire and all the anguish of this war.

We must realize how deeply Christian princi-

ples, the faiths and hopes we count most sacred, are involved in this conflict. We must see how absolutely and vitally Christian ideals and principles underlie the whole theory and practice of internationalism, for the furtherance of which we have been prosecuting the war.

What Christian principles and ideals are vitally involved in the war?

First we note that the very root of the system we are opposing is pagan, or anti-Christian. The war is, at deepest, a conflict between the pagan principle of competition, of self-advantage, and the Christian principle of coöperation and love.

These forces are struggling with each other all through our organized life. God keep us from the fatal error of supposing that all evil is on the side of our enemies! We could better afford to be blind to the faults of Germany than to be blind to the faults of America. In education, in business, in industry, everywhere, the two forces are locked in a fierce struggle. But that struggle is most evident, the line-up is most clear, the conflict is most openly avowed, in the political dealings of nations, and especially in the spirit of the one side and of the other in the present war.

A godless philosophy of evolution has gained prestige and power, and is at the root of the conduct of Germany throughout the course of the

war. It is at the root also of the whole organized opposition to the outworking of international order.

It is not the hypothesis of evolution as Darwin propounded it, as it has become accepted through the whole realm of our scientific and religious thinking, that is making the trouble. Henry Drummond and thousands of other Christians have found evolution a way to nobler and more soul-satisfying conceptions of God. It is when evolution is allied with a materialistic philosophy, that it comes into conflict with godliness, when it justifies and glorifies the brute in us, and exalts the law of the pack and the gang into the supreme law for states, and deifies the "struggle for existence" as carried out in the jungle into the supreme ideal of national conduct. Paganism, in its search for God, goes to the jungle, to nature, to the animal. Christianity, in its search for God, goes to humanity.

And now the two principles are in mortal combat, the jungle-view against the family-view of international relations.

Some months ago it was my privilege to hear Mr. Vernon Kellogg tell of his experiences under German rule in Belgium. His story was vastly more impressive for the restraint, the care not to exaggerate, which marked his recital. He illus-

trated the German temper in an instance which I venture to repeat.

In the discharge of his duties in connection with the Relief Commission in Belgium, it was necessary that a German officer be assigned to accompany him and pass upon all matters. Mr. Kellogg found it very difficult to get these officers to see the civilian side, the humane side, of the relief work. They were hard to move, unless they could be shown that positive military advantage for Germany would result from the particular case of relief-giving. Hearing that a former friend of university days in Germany had been incapacitated for active service by a wound, Mr. Kellogg eagerly asked that this old friend be assigned as his comrade in the work of relief. Knowing the man to be kind-hearted, loving in his home, a pleasant, humane man in all relationships, he expected no further trouble. But he found the officer harsh, strict, merciless, unwilling to concede anything, however trifling, to show any mercy, unless clearly for the advantage of the German cause. At last the American bluntly asked him how it was that he, kind at heart, loving in his home life, was so merciless toward the Belgian people. He answered readily enough that it was due to his philosophy of war and of the state. He said he believed that war takes the same place in the life of

nations that the struggle for existence takes in the life of animals. A slight lengthening of tooth or claw gives to the type the power to survive. That slight advantage must not be sacrificed. When war comes therefore, mercy must be put aside; ruthlessness becomes the only morality; kindness and consideration for feelings of humanity are weakening and immoral.

When such a theory of life and relationship gets a nation in its grip, then a war to keep that nation and that theory from dominance in the world is a war in defense of Christian ideals. For the very meaning and essence of Christianity is love, coöperation, the service of the weak by the strong. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is One Who says, in that quotation from Hosea which Jesus loved, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice."

There can be no question which is the Christian way, the way of ruthless competition, or the way of generous coöperation; the way of the jungle, or the way of humanity. When God said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," He meant it to govern not individuals and families only, but nations. He meant it to apply to Germany in her relations with Belgium, to Austria in her relations with Serbia, to the United States in her relations with Mexico and China. When the apostle gave

as the law of Christ the great principle that "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak," he set forth a principle which must be in eternal conflict with the law of self-advantage and exploitation, till it drive it out of the social life of mankind.

It is characteristic of the true Christian view of life also to hold that moral and religious principles apply everywhere, through the entire range of life.

President Wilson has stated this as one of the great aims of the war; to bring nations to where they will be governed in their relations with one another by "the same code of conduct that obtains among Christian gentlemen." Can there be any doubt that it is a Christian undertaking to attempt to bring about such a change in the relations between states?

General von Bernhardt is continually insisting that the principles of Christ and of ethics hold only for individuals; that nations are on another plane, where these moral and religious principles do not apply. Between that theory and the faith of the Christian that Christ is King of kings and Lord of lords there can be no compromise. Yet to adopt that view, that the principles of godliness set forth in the Word of God apply throughout the entire range of human life, would involve the condem-

nation of our past international relations, and the establishment of a new order of Christian internationalism.

Take a single instance. The 15th Psalm is often referred to as a portrait of "God's Gentleman." Read it internationally, applying it to the life and conduct of a state, and see how it condemns the old order for which Germany stands, and necessitates the new order for which we are beginning to see that we are fighting:

"Lord, what sort of nation is fit to dwell in Thy presence, worthy of a place of honor in Thy world?

"The nation that walks uprightly, and sets justice first among its aims, and speaks the truth to other nations and to itself.

"The nation that does not slander other peoples, nor set spies upon its neighbors,¹ nor cherish a grudge against another nation.

"The nation which despises reprobate nations, and seeks the friendship of those peoples that fear the Lord.

"The nation which stands by its international agreements even at a loss, and which does not employ its power to oppress the weaker, nor use its capital to exploit and dominate the helpless.

"Such a nation shall never be moved."

¹ Literal translation; cf. Briggs in loc.

What would the world be if that one little Psalm became the ideal of every nation?

We must come to see that if it is wrong for an individual to kill, and to steal, and to lie, it is wrong also for nations so to do. If Christian morality is not for the whole of life, it is too weak for any of it. Such a view of the social and political authority of the religious and ethical principles of Christ necessitates the outworking of an international order.

What are the legitimate objects of ambition? The Gospel has its answer. "Seek ye first His kingdom and His righteousness." "What shall it profit to gain the world and lose the soul?" Is that point of view true for nations, as well as for individuals? Certainly it is the direct contrary of the theory of legitimate ambition on which Germany has worked.

Down below the question whether a State, by marvelously efficient use of the resources of science, by merciless cultivation of military force, by subordination of all individual interests to the success of the state itself, can blast its way to world-dominion, lies the deeper question of the Christian Gospel, what shall it profit such a state to reach such a throne? It is the Christian view in conflict with the unchristian, that we see in this war. And the implication is clear for international life. No

international order is possible on the pagan theory of the legitimacy of selfish ambition. A sane and peaceful and lasting international life can come to the world only as nations accept the Gospel principle that it does not pay to seek national self-advantage at the expense of the welfare of other peoples, that a nation which does not set first the righteousness and the kingdom of God is in the way that leads to destruction.

What is the way to true greatness? Christ gives a ready and a clear answer. "The kings of the earth lord it over them; and their great ones are they that execute authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you. But whoso would be great among you, let him be your servant." Is it the word of a dreamer, an impossible theory of greatness? It is the last word of practical wisdom, the way to greatness which must be accepted by the nations as the only legitimate way, if ever an ordered and happy life for humanity is to come.

Who is in reality the great man? Which is in truth the great nation?

Some years ago, a newspaper in Paris conducted a plebiscite on the question, Who is the greatest man in the history of France? Every one thought the result a foregone conclusion. Of course Napoleon Bonaparte would receive the majority of the votes. But when the millions of votes were

counted, Napoleon ran a very bad second, and Louis Pasteur was named as the greatest of Frenchmen. Whoever sought greatness more insatiably than did Napoleon? Who ever cared less for honors, and more for service than Pasteur? The common sense of the mass of French people recognized the truth of the standard of Christ.

So long as false ideas of greatness remain to dazzle nations, so long will there be dangers of wars like the present. What a tragedy in the recent course of Germany! Seldom has any nation gone further or faster on the path toward greatness through service than Germany advanced in the decades just before the war. In science, in education, in production of what the world needed, in sending her product throughout the world, she was becoming the greatest of the nations. And then she turned away from that true path to tread the old, discredited, disgraceful, pagan path to greatness through force and dominion. It is one of the supreme tragedies of human history.

The world will be safe and secure in its peace only when nations adopt Christ's principle of greatness, and play fair with it.

Sound internationalism depends absolutely on the principle, enunciated with clearness and frequency through the Bible, that peace depends ever

upon righteousness. "The work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever." God is calling to a world that knows no peace, "O, that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments; then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea."

The principle of publicity, of open diplomacy, of the doing away with secret understandings and treaties, which President Wilson rightly classed among the great conditions of ordered and lasting peace, is fundamentally a Christian principle. "There is nothing hidden that shall not be revealed." "Speak ye every man truth with his neighbor, for we are members one of another." When nations live on that plane, and adopt that law of conduct, international peace and order will be an easy achievement.

Not only the principles underlying internationalism are distinctively Christian, but the very program of it is to be found first in the Gospel. Dr. Lyman Abbott has made the very interesting suggestion that in the Gospel of St. Matthew we find the very method advocated by the League to Enforce Peace for use in cases where disputes arise. Christ tells his followers,¹ in case disagreements arise, that the injured person shall first go and talk

¹ Matt. 18: 15-17.

over the matter with the other party to the trouble, trying to reach an adjustment; that failing, he is to take one or two witnesses or arbitrators with him; the next step is to tell the matter to the whole community;¹ and, if that fails, he is to count the injurer as a "heathen man or a publican," having nothing to do with him.

Here is the program exactly; first diplomacy, attempting to adjust the dispute between the two nations involved; then arbitration, reference to disinterested parties; then, submission of the case to the judgment and opinion of the world; and finally, non-intercourse, economic pressure. It is significant that Christ does not go on to sanction the final step of the use of physical force. May we assume that if nations put this program into effect, in an ordered and decisive way, the final resort to force would never be needed? In any event, Jesus does not forbid it.

Internationalism has no sound and firm basis save in Christian principles and ideals. And no one can take the principles and ideals of Jesus and His Gospel as authoritative throughout the range of human interests, and not believe in an international order, organized and maintained for the preservation of peace through the administration

¹ "Ecclesia" here evidently means "assembly" rather than "church."

of justice, as both possible and necessary. All the demands now vocal for disarmament, for greatness through service, for the rights of weaker nations, for the substitution of reason for might, and law for war, for the putting international intercourse on a human instead of an animal basis, all these are thoroughly Christian in spirit and meaning and aim. And no one who sincerely professes to be a Christian should fail to enlist among those who propose to bring in a new order of righteousness, and goodwill, and human brotherliness.

CHAPTER X

THE WAR AND INTERNATIONALISM

WHAT relation has this war to the movement toward an international order? How will it, and how does it, affect the coming of that era of organized justice, peace, and good-will for which we long and hope and pray and work?

Judged superficially, the war may seem to be the greatest blow ever dealt the cause of internationalism. It broke the bands that held mankind united. It came as a sudden and fierce negation of all that lovers of humanity had confidently affirmed and expected, a brutal denial of the whole program of international good-will, justice, and order. The delicate fabric of international law, woven so slowly and with such infinite pains, was shattered in a moment.

It seemed a tragedy, or a comedy, according to one's point of view, that just as the war broke there was in session at Constance the first conference of Christians of all nations in the interests of international peace and goodwill. The little group was scattered like a leaf blown before a furious gale. One of the delegates remarked that

apparently war could stop a peace conference far more easily than a peace conference could stop war. Some of us recall vividly the wonder and amusement in the faces of the German officers with whom we rode on our way back from that hurried and broken meeting, when we told them why we had come to Constance. Evidently they regarded it as the richest variety of joke that men and women had gone to Germany to hold a peace conference in the summer of 1914.

One of the first men to greet me on my return to America that summer was a friend of the positivistic type, who had always scorned idealistic movements. With an air of judicial satisfaction he said, "Well, I guess you peace people will keep quiet for awhile now."

It may seem the sudden and violent end of all faith and effort in the cause of internationalism. Germany has cast international morality to the winds. She broke the treaty safeguarding Belgium, the law of safety and search at sea, the custom of respect for neutral rights, her own agreement not to use poison gas in warfare, the ancient understanding that trees at least were to be spared, — embodied in the old law of the Hebrew people.¹ It seemed as if she had thrown international justice in the scrapheap.

¹ Cf. Deut. 20: 19 ff.

And the other nations followed her lead, compelled to do so in order to meet her attacks. It is a relief to know that, in the matter of the use of poison gas at least, America is technically guiltless, and Great Britain only less so. At the first Hague Conference, proposals were made that the nations agree not to use poisonous gases in warfare. Admiral Mahan put forward a strong argument against such an agreement, and America and Great Britain declined to join in such an understanding. Other nations, including Germany, entered into a positive agreement, however, to abstain from the use of gas. Later Great Britain gave her adherence to the agreement; but the United States never did so.

But the plain fact is that international law and understanding have been violated and broken very generally in the stress of this merciless war. Reprisals have been made, mines sown at sea, vessels illegally held, blockades declared in violation of the common law of warfare; and it might well seem as if international justice and order had suffered like the invaded territories, the damage being beyond hope of restoration.

But this is only a surface view of the situation. Certain great facts stand out which lead us to declare that this war is, in reality, the greatest forward step ever taken toward internationalism.

First of all, Germany's action in precipitating the war is a mighty testimony to the growing force of the movement toward an international order.

Germany, as a state, has always been distrustful of any peace propaganda, of any real movement toward an international understanding. Hopelessly committed to the imperialistic idea of world politics, the leaders of Germany have seemed unable to see a world organized on the basis of free and friendly coöperation as either possible or desirable. Germany has stood as the great champion of the doctrine of absolute and irresponsible national sovereignty.

Just as our Civil War was a proof of the growing sense of nationalism in this country, a sentiment so strong that the advocates of State's Rights felt compelled to fight for the existence of their doctrine before it was too late; so this war proves the growing power in the world of the ideals of internationalism, a power so evidently on the increase that the rulers of Prussia felt forced to fight for the principle of irresponsible nationalism before it was too late. Whether or no they saw it clearly, they felt it powerfully, that the cause of internationalism was closely and inseparably united with the cause of democracy, with all those social developments and movements and forces which they feared most in their own country.

The plunge into war is a strong proof of the growing power of the movement toward internationalism, in the success of which the rulers of Germany would have found their downfall.

We see also, very clearly, that the violations and disregard of international law and agreement on the part of the nations opposed to Germany are a passing phase of their conduct, not a permanent characteristic of it. In very large part they have taken to such practices in self-defense. To sink a submarine on sight may be technically a violation of sea-law, but it is the only way to meet the illegal attacks of the submarines. To bomb unfortified towns in Germany may be the only way to bring home to German consciousness the iniquity of the air raids they have practiced against English and French towns.

A story, credited to Mr. Zangwill, illustrates clearly the difference between Germany's original and flagrant breaches of international law, and the violation of law and custom in which the Entente nations have indulged in return. The story is of a Doukhobor, one of the many who emigrated from Russia to Canada to escape religious persecution. One of the tenets of the sect,—so the story goes,—is to wear as little clothing as possible. One very hot day a Doukhobor strolled into a Canadian town quite naked. A policeman,

catching sight of him, started to arrest him. The Doukhobor fled across the fields, and the policeman followed. The policeman was clad in full uniform, and the heat soon became unbearable. He noticed that he was losing ground. So he cast aside his helmet, later his coat, then his shoes and stockings, so one garment after another, until, when he caught the Doukhobor, he was in the same unclothed condition. The Doukhobor said, "You're just as bad as I am." But the policeman replied, "No; for you left off your clothes because you chose to do it, and I threw mine off only that I might catch you; and now, having caught you, I shall go back and pick them up and put them on again."

It is not a partisan judgment when we say that, on the whole, the Entente nations have violated international agreements only reluctantly, in self-defense, and with full purpose, deepening with the course of the war, to resume the full practice of international justice, and to establish it more firmly for the world's life.

Many have noted a further evidence of the power of internationalism, as revealed in the circumstances and conduct of the war. This is in the fact that never before have nations, going to war, shown such eager concern to justify their conduct in the eyes of the world. The flood of White

Books, Red Books, and other documents, each making out a case for some nation or group of nations, showed an unprecedented regard for "the opinion of mankind." When was there another war in which every participant was eager to prove that the war was, on its own part, defensive? In the speeches and writings of German leaders, during the first two or three years of fighting, one phrase was always to be found, "this war, which was forced upon us." Why so elaborately, so protestingly eager to disown their work, had not the sense of international justice grown to a greatness which demanded at least the semblance of respect?

We note again that the war has emphasized, with increasing force, that for which men of international mind have been contending.

A striking article, worthy of the widest circulation, appeared in a recent issue of the *Christian Work*, entitled "Have the Peace Societies Failed?" It admitted that many think that the Peace Societies have utterly failed; and then went on to show that, one after another, the great objects for which the Peace Societies have been striving during the past two decades have been avowed by the great nations as the ends for which they are fighting; that, moreover, the strongest consciousness of the real moral aims of the war is to be

found precisely in those nations in which the Peace Societies have been most active and most effective. Can a movement be said to have failed when the greatest nations adopt its ideals as their own, and declare that they will fight to the end of their resources rather than abandon those ideals?

I have spoken of the friend who greeted me on my return from Constance in the summer of 1914, with the remark, "I guess you peace people will keep quiet for a while now." The retort was obvious, "Suppose you had been warning a group of men for years that a certain course of action would lead to disaster, and they kept on, and disaster came; would you feel ashamed of your warnings?"

The war has made a sane and right internationalism seem more desirable, more indispensable, than ever it seemed in the past.

Most important of all is the fact that the war has assumed more and more the character of a conflict in the interests of internationalism.

The nations opposed to Germany entered the war, and have stayed in it, because they know it to be an attempt, on the part of the organized forces of humanity, to punish an international crime, and to vindicate international justice.

If a nation can do what Germany has done to Belgium, and escape punishment for it, then inter-

national law is a mockery. It is not simply Belgium that is interested in having that wrong righted; it is all mankind. It was in defense of internationalism that America entered the war. We had our own wrongs to avenge, our own rights to maintain, our own dangers to avert. But no one who knows the mind and soul of the American people can doubt that we would never have gone into the war for these reasons only. We went in as a united people, ready for any sacrifice, because we realized that the whole cause of international law and order was at stake. Other nations had other issues to fight out with the Teutons. France had Alsace-Lorraine and the wrong of 1870. Britain had the danger to her sea-power, and to her interests in the East. Italy had her interests around the Adriatic. But the only real issue between America and Germany is the issue of internationalism. We believe in it, she never has. We see that the world can never again be safe if such acts as the violation of Belgium can be safe and profitable.

The German Empire has been built up by wars of aggression, planned in advance, deliberately started at chosen times, from each of which the military power of Germany has emerged with great profit in territory and resources. Society is not safe so long as lawbreaking is clearly profit-

able. Germany might never have acted as she did in August, 1914, had she not found such self-seeking, unscrupulous, deliberately aggressive conduct toward other states safe and enormously profitable in 1870, in 1866, and in the time of Frederick the Great. For the sake of Germany herself, and for the sake of all the world of our hopes, we must make clear once for all that,—to use the forcible language of the street,—no nation can *do such things and get away with it*.

The war has also come increasingly to assume the character of an attempt to establish an international order, firmer and more highly-developed than the past has ever known. President Wilson has made this central in his statements of the aims of the war. Other statesmen have come to ever clearer and more positive conviction that out of the war must come a League of Free Nations, organized to secure peace through the administration of international justice. The war has thus come to be not only an attempt to vindicate international order as it was, but a determined effort to establish international order as the world has never yet seen it. Moreover, the present struggle, as the British Premier has pointed out, is an effort on the part of the world to enforce peace against an offender. The winning of the war is thus vital to the establishment of any league of

nations; for how can any league of nations hope to maintain justice and peace in the future if they cannot now enforce their claims against an offender?

Under the stress and sacrifice of war thought and planning have gone far. Men and nations are ready, as never before, to dare set up an international order which shall be strong enough to compel respect. They are determined that, so far as in them lies, war shall be prevented for the future.

The war is also showing us the cost of internationalism, awakening us to the seriousness of the cause of international peace and justice.

The fatal defect of movements for international justice, peace, and goodwill in the past has been their fluency, their easy optimism, their assumption that human nature and the nature of human society could be changed over night by a stream of good talk. We are learning to see a new strength and sternness in that word "peace-makers." To make peace is to do a supremely difficult thing. It costs blood and treasure and the sacrifice of all except honor. Many have bandied the phrase, "Peace at any price." Well, we are learning what a fearful price must be paid for it; and our glib phrases fade at the vision. There is no easy path to peace and plenty and safety and right-

cousness. We have talked as if, any day, all men might suddenly say, "Come, let us stop being fools, and henceforth live in perpetual peace and goodwill." New light has come to us on the matter of suffering; we have begun to discern it as part of the basic fabric of all achievement. We see the path to justice and peace and stable international order as a terribly hard and sacrificial road, a Via Sacra because it is a Via Dolorosa. Men instinctively rate values in terms of cost. It may be that the awful cost of this war was necessary to make men value international justice and peace highly enough to be willing to do the hard thinking and work and make the personal and national sacrifices essential to the establishment and maintenance of a right international order.

The war is also actually working to bring into organized and unified life the progressive, peace-loving nations.

The President has said, simply but with deep meaning, that we and our allies are now "eating at a common table,"—a fact which brings our international relationships into intimate touch with the deepest sanctities of our religion. The Son of Man is breaking bread to us all. There is a pooling of interest, and a complete interchange of need and resources, in our shipping, our armed forces, our varied supplies. We are forgetting

old animosities, and becoming ashamed of prejudices that have lingered long. The Briton, the Frenchman, the Italian,—we estimate them now by their noblest, not by their most unpleasant traits. There has come about the organization of an Allied Council, and the appointment of a single commander, which is the nearest approach in practice the world has yet made to the creation of an international police force. Especially significant is the cordial relationship growing up between Great Britain and America. It is well that we remind ourselves that such a relationship cannot go too far. Our natural course is to live in extreme friendliness with Britain. Many elements unite to make this the natural order. We have a common language, common political traditions and ideals, a common literary heritage. We are both vitally concerned in the use of the seas, and in seeing that international trade is kept clear and open. We have a common interest in this Western hemisphere,—an interest shared by no other great world power. For Canada comes under the operation of the Monroe Doctrine, or that doctrine is worthless. Moreover it is the fact that Great Britain has a vital interest in this continent that has given the Monroe Doctrine its force; for the silent support of Britain's navy has been the biting edge of the Monroe Doctrine.

We have proved that we are good neighbors, as that unfortified border of 3000 miles, and the peace between us for more than a century, conclusively prove. Finally, we are more akin in our concern for democracy and for a sane, strong internationalism than are any other two peoples. At every stage America has found strong support from Great Britain in the outworking of her national and international ideals,—save at the period of our Civil War. It was the support of the better elements of British society which made possible the winning of our Revolution against a German prince who misrepresented the spirit of the kingdom over which he ruled. Again and again has our country felt the quiet comradeship of Great Britain. It is perhaps the greatest single source of hope for a good and just future for humanity that the war has brought our two nations into relations so cordial and thoroughgoing.

The war is a war for Internationalism, to defend what we have of it, and to secure a larger measure of it than we have ever dared attempt to realize.

An American in France noticed a little group of American soldiers. One of them, a lanky youth, obviously from the mountain country of Tennessee or Kentucky, was handling a rifle familiarly, and talking about fighting and being wounded. The

observer said in surprise, "How do you know so much about war? You are too young to have been in any war, aren't you?" With a characteristic drawl, he replied, "Wall, this is the first *public* war I ever was in." Beneath the unconscious drollery, the revelation of conditions of border feuds, lies a big truth. This is about the first *public* war the world has known, the first war waged not for private interests, but for the public good, for the hopes and faiths and needs of humanity. Here is one of the greatest reasons why the war had to be pressed to full and final victory, why no premature peace could be tolerated. This war was inextricably bound up with the cause of internationalism, which is humanity's hope for the future. The triumph of Germany would have meant a growing imperialism; an indecisive outcome would have meant a perpetuation, in far worse degree, of the old international anarchy. The triumph of the humane group of nations means the possibility of a free and ordered life for mankind, in which the souls of men shall be at liberty to go about their legitimate business of art and work and play and love and religion, unhampered by the heavy hand of militarism and imperialism.

The war means that, for better or for worse, the nations have been drawn, or thrown, together;

and "what God hath joined, let not man put asunder."

Just as our great Civil War brought to final and splendid realization the ideal of a united nation, so this war must bring the realization of the ideal of a united world, in which we shall see,—not now for one nation, but for all the nations that make up the common life of humanity,—“union and liberty, now and forever, one and inseparable.”

CHAPTER XI

THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONALISM

IT is Christian Internationalism that we have been discussing; not merely the principles and ideals and program of an international order, as they may and should appeal to all right-minded men; but the cause of internationalism as something which should appeal with peculiar force to men who believe in God and find Him revealed in Jesus Christ.

In such a discussion the question of the relation of the church to the cause becomes of vital importance. Religion has ever been one of the mightiest forces at work among men. The church, organized religion, is a potent factor in social evolution. Once get it actively interested in any movement, make its potencies actual, and it can accomplish great things.

If the church is true to her own great ideals, set before her by her Master, if she is responsible to the true spirit within her, and has the ear wherewith to "hear what the Spirit is saying unto the churches," she will see and seize this movement

toward internationalism as peculiarly her own, her own because of what she can do for it, and, no less, because of what it may do for her.

The church can contribute elements of power immensely, even vitally important, elements so great and strong that the success or failure of the movement toward a firmer and better international life may hang on what the church does or fails to do.

The church can aid greatly by helping to provide certain indispensable conditions of success. It can give to the cause of Internationalism a Sanction, a Spirit, and a Dynamic.

We have seen, in our discussion of the Problems Confronting Internationalism, that one of the most serious needs is that of providing adequate sanctions for the World-Organization. We mentioned some which would have great force, the economic, the military. Without these the international order would never be strong and permanent. But we saw also that something more was needed, an appeal to the imagination, a challenge to the affections, something to do for the international cause what the flag does for patriotism. Men's hearts must be caught and held, if they are ever to give to the world-order that high and firm loyalty without which it must surely fail.

Here the church has it in its power to help

mightily. For it can give to the International Order something of the glory of the Kingdom of God.

All through the long ages during which the Christian ideal was slowly taking shape and gathering force, the hope of a coming Kingdom has glowed with inspiring grace before the eyes of the men of God. The prophets saw its day and sang of its glory. Christ set it in the very center of the prayer He taught His disciples, and talked of that Kingdom more frequently than of any other theme. The church has had much to say about "salvation," but the Master spoke of the "Kingdom of God" ten times for every mention He made of salvation. The Bible ends with glowing pictures of that Kingdom of God realized on earth. The hymns of the church are bright with its glory. The true Christian feels his heart-loyalty claimed above all by this Kingdom that is to come. He is ready to give to it an allegiance higher and deeper than that which he gives to any other cause on earth.

But the Christian has never had a clear and assured answer to the question, What is this great Kingdom of God for which you are to work and to pray and to spend yourself? Is it heaven, some city of God lying afar in an after life? So thought Bernard of Clairvaux, and so many others

have thought, transferring their loyalty from present to future, and from earth to heaven. But the best religious sense to-day is alive to the conviction that the Kingdom of Heaven is a state of society on earth. We see that the glowing picture of the *Civitas Dei*, set before us in the final pages of the Bible, is a picture of a society of men here on the earth, a Civilization to be built up here. Christians see now that to sing *de contemptu mundi* is to sing as no Christian should. That Kingdom for which we pray and labor must be something here on earth.

Is it the church? So some have thought. But few Christians in any age have taken the church as equivalent to the Kingdom, and therefore as claiming their supreme allegiance. The best Christian insight has always clearly discerned the fact that the church is the agent of the Kingdom, the means of which the Kingdom of God is the end, the scaffolding necessary to the erection of the structure, but to disappear when the work is completed; for in that City of God no temple is to be found.

Can we identify the Kingdom of God with the nation? The Jew found no difficulty in making such an identification. To him the Kingdom of God was nothing more nor less than the realized glory of Israel. In the intensity of nationalistic

feeling evoked by the war, it may be possible for some to see no higher conception of the Kingdom that is to come than a glorified America, or Britain, or Germany. I heard a leading churchman say not long ago that the highest function of the church in the future must be the exaltation of patriotism, that the honor and integrity of the nation is the highest object toward which churchmen can direct their loyalty. But there are few true Christians who do not see and feel that such a definition of the Kingdom of God would degrade the American Christian church to the low level of the German churchmanship revealed in "Hurrah and Hallelujah," or in the blind nationalistic zeal of the signers of that amazing declaration put forth by the German churchmen and professors in the opening days of the war.

None of these conceptions will serve the best, present-day mind with regard to the Kingdom of God. Where then shall we find it? Suppose we could see in this proposed International Organization, this World-State, the political expression of the Kingdom of God! And why should we not? It would be the fulfillment of the Magnificat on the broadest and grandest scale possible, this free union of free nations to secure world-wide justice and peace, and to make mankind a brotherhood; it would be the best possible realization, in terms of

actual, concrete living, of the great ideals of Isaiah and Jeremiah and Ezekiel, of Jesus and Paul and the seer on Patmos. What is there, in the whole range of the Christian imagination, that can so fully and nobly realize the dream of a Kingdom of God come true among men, as can this installation of an international order, a loyalty free from all alloy of competition, narrowness, and selfishness, a loyalty worthy of those who claim to be followers of the Son of Man?

If once the church can claim this cause of internationalism as its own, a powerful sanction will be given to it; something of the majesty and glory of the New Jerusalem will attach to the rising walls of the international order. The mighty force of Christian loyalty, the force which inspired the hosts of martyrs and apostles and missionaries, will be set at work for the establishment and maintenance of the international order.

No one who looks deeper than the surface, and sees things as they are, can fail to discern the power that has been set free in the service of the Entente nations, by the conviction that they are fighting for something bigger and more honorable and more commanding than any nationalistic interests. It is impossible to calculate the value, just as a military asset, of that consciousness that, on our side, this war is a crusade for the sake of all

humanity. Such a realization comes close to the heart of the Christian faith, and gives the church a chance that should be eagerly seized, to serve as no other organization can serve, to give to this international movement and to the international organization which shall come from it the highest and holiest of all sanctions, the commanding glory of the Kingdom of God.

The church can also render great aid by helping to contribute a spirit, without which the international movement must fail.

In that greatest of all peace pamphlets to which we have referred more than once, Kant gives as one of the three essential conditions of the achievement of lasting peace, the extension of the spirit of goodwill among all men and all nations.

Here the church can find its legitimate function. If the church of Christ is not vitally concerned in the extension of goodwill, it has forfeited its right to exist.

We have already referred to the missionary enterprise of the church as revealing the international spirit of Christianity. Here in the extension of goodwill between nations and races is a further opportunity which the church should be eager to seize. A movement has been begun which aims to realize this ideal, to make the Christian church a potent factor in the extension of

goodwill among all peoples. It had its origin as already stated in an attempt to use the churches to bring about better and more cordial relations between Great Britain and Germany, in the early years of the present century. Started too late to affect very powerfully the growing distrust between the two nations, powerless to stem the rising tide of arrogant nationalism in Germany, it nevertheless planted seeds which, like that tiniest of seeds of which the Master told, will some day grow to greatness of influence. We are confident that those seeds have not all died out, even in Germany.

The movement seemed so full of promise that, in the year 1914, the plan was made to extend it to all nations, making it a world-movement. Delegates from the Protestant churches of all nations gathered at the historic town of Constance in the opening days of August, 1914. The storm of war scattered the gathering almost as soon as they arrived. But those privileged to attend the few and hurried sessions felt that they were sharing in one of the great events of Christian history, when men of many races and nations and points of view realized their loyalty to that which transcended their differences.

A conference of Catholic Christians was to have followed, at Liège; but at the time set for the con-

ference, Liège was in the hands of the Germans, and the host of the proposed conference, Cardinal Mercier, was proving that the true internationalist is also the truest patriot.

Out of this hasty effort came the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. It has its councils in all the nations of Christendom, and its International Committee of delegates from all nations. In every country it numbers among its supporters many loyal patriots, and none disloyal to their country. It keeps alive, amid the blighting conditions of war, the sense of international brotherhood and friendship. The members of the German Council of the World Alliance, when the war broke, immediately published and distributed a translation of the British White Book, the first, perhaps the only, real attempt to get the German people to understand the British view of the origin of the war. They also turned their attention to the care of British prisoners in German detention and prison camps. No connection is maintained, of course, between the German council and the members of the World Alliance in the countries at war with the Central Powers; but we are confident that in all of Germany there is no group that will show itself more eager to resume brotherly relations, once the war is over, than the little

group connected with the World Alliance of Churches.

Quietly the movement has spread among the neutral nations, in England, and in America. In the United States it is giving much of its thought and means to encouraging goodwill between America and the Orient, and to furthering the cause of intelligent study of the international movement and its principles and ideals. Small though it is, it holds within itself the potency of the Christian Church as an agent of goodwill and friendliness on earth. It points the way toward an adequate discharge of one of the chief duties and opportunities of the church in the cause of a sane and lasting internationalism.

The third contribution the church can make to this great cause is a *dynamic*.

We have seen, in the chapter in which we discussed the problems confronting the international movement, that the great need is faith, resolute determination to do the needful thing, however chimerical it may look to worldly wisdom. The church is here on earth to furnish faith for the great affairs of men. It is the proper and supreme social function of the church to provide inspiration for every good work.

The church here in America ought to be pouring forth streams of faith and courage and hope

for the support of the nation, of our soldiers and sailors, of all who serve the cause of our nation and its allies. I believe that the church in America is giving mighty aid in just that way; that thousands on thousands of our boys have been fighting the more bravely in France, and working the more cheerfully in the camps, and standing by their tasks at sea with greater fortitude, and flying through the air with fuller courage, because they know that the church at home is praying for them, and singing every Sunday hymns of stirring patriotism and of loving regard for them in their absence. When dark days have come, when the fight has gone against us, or we have feared the insidious demoralization of a "peace offensive," there has come from our churches a power to stiffen the national will to righteousness, a strength from God to aid His men in His cause.

But the church can and should do more. It should arouse and inspire and quicken the faith of men continually in the ideals and principles of Christian Internationalism. When many are shaking their heads, scornfully thrusting aside proposals for an international order as chimerical, the church should stand for the Christian conviction that faith can move mountains, that nothing can oppose successfully God and His people. It should sound forth in the ears of all the faint-

hearted the splendid message of the Master, "Fear not; only believe." It is the richest and most promising opportunity that has come to the church for ages, to fulfill its function as a fountain of faith.

All this and more the church has to contribute to the cause of internationalism. But its relation to this movement and cause is not wholly found in giving. The church has something to gain from making the cause of internationalism its own.

In a hearty espousal of the cause of internationalism the church can "find itself." It has suffered from spending itself on petty tasks, from being tamed, domesticated, until men lost interest in it and respect for it. Once let the church feel itself the divine instrument of a great and holy cause, of immense significance to the world, and days of power and glory and splendor will come to her again. Many have longed for a "revival of faith." But what we need most is not a revival of intellectual or theological opinions, but of that faith which is a fire in the soul and in the bones, faith as an active principle, the faith that puts the martyr-spirit into a man and into a church. Here is a cause, a movement, which holds the promise of the dreams of the prophets, the visions of the apostles, the goal set by the Master of Christians. Let the church give herself to that great cause, and

she will find her soul, and stand before men as worthy of their respect, and love, and loyalty.

And here also, in this great cause, the church will find her best chance to recover her lost international character. No one can doubt that the church was meant to be a brotherly movement and order, transcending all national and racial bounds, uniting men of all sorts through a higher loyalty. The church lost this character at the time of the Reformation. It can never again stand as a single political entity, dominating the world-life. But it may stand as a world-brotherhood, giving sanctity to a world-organization of humanity.

All through the history of the church, even in the days when individualism flourished most profusely, there lingered in true Christian hearts a sense that Christianity was something that transcended human differences. Part of that hesitation to take sides which marked the American church in August, 1914,—so severely blamed by some critics,—was due, as we have said, not to cowardice, or lack of vision, but to a vague sense that the Christian church ought to rise above partisan views, and nationalistic issues, a dread lest the church forget its international character and responsibilities. That sense of the international character of Christianity had grown so strong just before the war, in the Foreign Missionary enter-

prise, the Christian Associations, the International Student Movement, and many other world-organizations for specific religious ends. These have been shattered by the war. Yet a stronger unity has come to some of them among the nations now in comradeship of arms. And sometime the severed parts of the Christian church will come together again. If only the Christian church will have the Christian insight to ally itself firmly with the cause of internationalism, to see the logical and Christian connection between a League of Nations to secure justice and peace and the meaning and aim of the church itself, the greatest and best day for the church of Christ since He was here will have dawned. Then will be brought to pass the saying that is written in a letter from an unknown writer of the second century of our era,—

“What the soul is in the body, that are Christians in the world. For the soul holds the body together, and Christians hold the world together. This illustrious position has been assigned them of God, which it were unlawful for them ever to forsake.”

CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSIONS

CERTAIN great convictions, reactions, and duties face us as we reach the end of this discussion and turn to survey the country through which we have come.

I. There are five convictions that come to us with great force, the framework of a strong, consistent, and persistent policy of internationalism.

1. The first is the conviction that *Christ has to do, and therefore Christians have to do, with the whole of life.*

A common view of the relation of the godly to the life about them is that of a pilgrim passing through a country on his way to some desired place. He naturally wants to do all the good he can as he passes through, but he has no sense of responsibility for the solution of the social problems that trouble the communities through which he passes. What he can contribute of social helpfulness is simply done by the way.

It would be hard to say whether on the whole the thoughts of Christians about the future life,

their tendency to put the emphasis on heaven rather than on the present world, have had a good or an evil effect. Certainly the tendency has not been all to the good. The hope of heaven has been a help. But the exaggerated consciousness of it, the dwelling upon it until a spiritual farsightedness has developed in which all things close at hand become blurred, has been a source of unmeasured evil. It has kept Christians from playing their proper part in the life of the world. It is time Christians took to heart what Paul said in a sentence which has never in any translation received recognition of its real significance. In the Authorized Version it reads, "Only let your conversation be as becometh the Gospel of Christ." In the Revised Version it is given in the form, "Only let your manner of life be as becometh the Gospel of Christ. What Paul really wrote is "Act as citizens in a manner worthy of the Gospel of Christ." He may have had his thoughts on a heavenly citizenship; but we shall never be true to the mission and function Christ set for us until we take the injunction as referring to our conduct as citizens of our own nation and of the world.

Critics of the New Testament often condemn it for its "otherworldliness." But it is amazing how practical the New Testament is in its em-

phasis on conduct now and here. It is Christians, with their misinterpretations, that are responsible for the reputation of otherworldliness which attaches to the Bible. We have transferred to another world great sections of the New Testament which plainly refer to affairs here. We read "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him"; and our thoughts fly at once to heaven and its glories, awaiting the blessed ones who die in the Lord. Read the passage and you will see that what Paul has in mind is the wonderful preparation God has made to bless men in this life. We talk of resurrection and heaven as future possibilities. Paul is constantly telling us that God *hath* raised us, and hath made us sit in the heavenly realm with Christ. Ask a Christian of ordinary Biblical knowledge what the Book of Revelation deals with, and it is practically certain that he will tell you that it deals with heaven. There is astonishingly little in that book relating to the future life. Its glowing pictures are attempts to portray the crowning civilization to which this world may come under the lordship and leadership of Christ. The "New Jerusalem" comes down from heaven to take its place on earth.

Ask the average Christian what it means to be

"saved," and he will probably answer that it means to "go to heaven." But that is very far removed from the most common idea in the New Testament. There a saved man is a man who is living *now* in fellowship with God, and in line with the great humane and redemptive purposes of Christ.

There is a text of great significance in one of Paul's later letters. In it he speaks of Christ as "Saviour of all, specially of them that believe." It is a text quite unintelligible on the basis of the old individualistic and otherworldly view of Christianity. But it is full of light for one who has caught the new (and yet the very oldest) conception of the mission of Christianity. Is not that just what Christ has been, and still is, doing? While His Gospel ever has a very special meaning and value to those who believe and so find entrance into the life of fellowship with God in Christ, it is lifting up and redeeming all of human life. Hospitals, and settlements, juvenile courts, welfare work, child conservation, Red Cross effort, and the rest, are for all men and for the welfare and happiness of all society.

We have come much nearer to the mind of Christ in moving on from an exclusively individualistic to a socialized interpretation of the mission and meaning of Christianity. Had you asked

a good churchman of a century ago what was meant by the text, "It is not the will of your Father in heaven that one of these little ones should perish," he would probably have answered that it warrants the belief that all who die in infancy are saved. Ask a thoughtful modern Christian, and he will be likely to answer that it condemns child labor, and all forms of the exploitation of youth.

Decisive proof that it is the chief business of the Christian to make this world different through his Christianity is found in the standard of character which Jesus left for us. What did He reckon the worst of sins? Look through His Gospel, and you can have no doubt. Two sins are there condemned as no others are, unless we except that hypocrisy which characterized the Pharisees whom He so sternly judged. These two sins are *unbrotherliness*, and *slackness*; and they seem closely associated in His mind. Robert Louis Stevenson got the Christ point of view when he said that the only really grave sins are sins of omission. Jesus visits severest condemnation on the men who are unloving and the men who do nothing.

He drew for us just one picture of a man in hell. What had the man done? We are only told of something he had failed to do; he had neg-

lected the poor man at his gate. For all we are told, Dives may have been moral, orthodox, pious, a model of all individual virtues. But he failed to do the things God set before him, failed to affect for the better the wrong social condition confronting him; and Christ chooses him as the example of the man who goes to hell.

Jesus painted one picture of the Last Judgment, more solemn and awful than Michaelangelo's great canvas. He shows us a group on whom is pronounced the severe judgment, "and these shall go away into eternal punishment." What have they done? Nothing, so far as we are told. We are only told of that which they had *not* done. "Inasmuch as ye did it not"; that is all.

Christ left a graphic picture of a man who failed, the man with one talent. What had he done? Again the answer comes, He had done nothing; that was his damning fault. Similar is the meaning of the story about the Wedding Garment. The man is cast into outer darkness, because of *slackness*. Even so the foolish damsels are left outside because of neglect to provide what they might need.

Nothing is more certain from these passages, and from all others where our Lord touches at all on the life-and-death problems of human character and conduct, than that He meant that His fol-

lowers should make a difference in the world in which they live. His chosen symbol, "salt," emphasizes that fact with great force. What is salt for, if not to flavor that with which it mingles? This world is not a mine, or pit, out of which the salt is to be extracted for use elsewhere. The world is a mass of stuff needing to have salt mixed with it for its flavoring and preserving; and Christians are "salt of the earth" not in order to be set apart, but to be mixed with the life of the world most intimately for the healing and flavoring of that life, to give it wholesomeness and zest.

The "otherworldly" conception of the function of Christianity persists so tenaciously, and with so unwholesome an influence, that we must be eternally on guard against it. We must realize that too often, in ourselves and in others, the emphasis on the creed, on the future life, on the "preaching of the simple gospel," on the importance of orthodox opinions, and the like, is only a means of escape from the uncomfortable requirements of that social mission and message which is the real Gospel of Jesus Christ.

2. The second conviction coming from our discussion is that *the history of God's dealings with man has been a record of growing brotherhood, of which the rightful climax is a brotherhood of nations.*

We have tried to trace, through the record of the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the history of the Christian church, the patient effort of the Father to lead His chosen people, those who have had His clearest light on their pathway, to throw over their exclusiveness, to distrust that which set them apart from other men, and enter into a fellowship as wide as humanity. May it not be that the intense hatred Jesus felt for Pharisaism was in part due to the very name, which means "Separated," "Set apart"?

The revelation of God, the outworking of His divine will for man, lacks its capstone, without the establishment of Christian Internationalism. The Bible opens with a picture of one man and one woman living in a garden, sufficient to themselves, and with little to occupy them but their individual fellowship with God. Some pious people never get beyond the religion of the Garden of Eden. But the Bible gets far beyond that, until it ends with a great multitude, of all races and tongues and customs and nationalities, flowing like a river of life through the streets of a city, a world-community, open to all sorts and conditions of men, a city with gates on all four sides and always open, a city including in its citizenship men and women and children of all the nations; the "kings," the governments, find their place in it.

Gold is not too precious for the paving of its streets, nor jewels too costly to be built into its walls; and a multitude which no man can number goes singing through the streets. The revelation of God will be incomplete until we move on to that climax of a world-brotherhood, a universal Christian civilization in which all men and nations live in ordered justice and reverence and peace.

3. The third conviction is that *the cause of the people is the cause of God, and leads directly on to the establishment of an international order.*

As the course of religious development has flowed steadily on toward a widening and deepening sense of brotherhood, so the course of political development has flowed toward increasing democracy. And the two great streams unite to-day to form a mighty river of God's life for the people on earth. Democracy is a holy cause, supremely worth dying for or living for.

Henry Ward Beecher once said that the secret of the deathless influence of the Bible is in the fact that it is "always on the side of man, and man will not let it die." Christ is the source of our modern political idealism, no less than of our religious aspirations and principles. Democracy is sacred; and it blends with true religion to demand and to produce a sane and permanent international order. Neither religion nor democracy can ever have its

perfect work until a sane and strong international order is established. As American Christians, we cannot fail to be internationalists in the best sense. If we are not ardent internationalists we are failures as Americans, as Christians, or as both.

4. The fourth fundamental conviction is that true internationalism, so far from being antagonistic to patriotism, or inconsistent with it, is its very fruitage.

The man who sets patriotism over against internationalism, as if the two were mutually exclusive, or as if internationalism were a parasite thriving on the life-strength of patriotism, shows that he has a false sense of both these great terms. There is so great and grave misunderstanding right here that we may well stop a moment to repeat and emphasize what was said earlier, that to believe in an international order does not weaken but rather fulfills and deepens one's loyalty to his own nation. It is because I love America so much that I want her to do her full duty to humanity. It is because I have such confidence in her ideals as essentially right, and in her power as invincible, that I am willing to have her enter the frankest and fullest sort of fellowship with all nations. It is only a false, selfish, unworthy nationalism, unentitled to the fine name of patriotism, that suffers from the growth of the spirit of

a true, sane, fervent internationalism. Patriotism that distrusts internationalism always is concealing something false and unworthy under its fine garments.

In truth, each loyalty to the larger unit makes deeper and finer the loyalty to the lesser unit. A man is a better father for being a good neighbor; a better neighbor for being a good townsman; a better townsman for being a good patriot; and a better patriot for being a good internationalist. Why should that process halt at the boundaries of the nation? The doctrine of a restricted and selfish nationalism as the ultimate loyalty is as unprogressive and as impossible as was the doctrine of States' Rights; and it must give way before the life of humanity can be right and peaceful, even as the States' Rights doctrine had to be decisively put down before our national government could be strong and stable. Those are wisest, most in line with the needs and the call of the future, who mean to use this war as the end of irresponsible nationalism, and the beginning of that sane and strong internationalism, in which true patriotism finds its fulfillment.

5. The last of the five convictions to which we have referred is that *the definite plans now offered for an international order, and the movement to put them into effect, are strong and practical.*

They are doubtless idealistic; they are not chimerical.

Honest effort has been made in Chapter VIII to state the very serious difficulties which must be met and mastered before the cause of ordered internationalism can be successful. No one can rightly think that the international movement has an easy task before it. Far more than fine phrases or good talk will be needed to bring a single atom of its program into real being.

Yet the movement can be condemned as impractical only by those who have no vision, and leave no room in their world for the working of human faith and hope. The strongest leaders of the world's life to-day are leading in the cause of internationalism. If a firm and just international order is not set up, our victory will be barren, and our professions stultified. There is scarcely a responsible leader of political life in America and Great Britain who is not heartily committed to the cause of a League of Nations. To call the roll of its supporters is to call wellnigh every name of the men who count. And the few strong men who do not espouse the cause are careful to say that it is a desirable scheme, and that their objection is simply to its practicability.

There was a time, not very long ago, when the cause of international peace and justice and good-

will seemed to enlist only the hairbrained and quixotic, the "long-haired men and short-haired women." The word "pacifist" has fallen into disrepute largely because it was used so much by fanatics and fools. But a new note was sounded, and a new set of men came into the movement in America for international peace and justice, when the League to Enforce Peace was organized. The cause of internationalism has become serious, sane, and splendid, under the guidance and care of cool, hardheaded, farseeing men. The church is taking a growing interest in it. The very interesting and successful work of the National Committee on the Churches and the Moral Aims of the War during the present year is a strong proof that the best and most thoughtful and most patriotic sections of our population respond instantly and heartily to the presentation of a sane and Christian ideal of internationalism. The movement has been conclusively shown to have not only high ideals, but practical good sense in it.

These five big convictions stand out from our discussion. They make this cause of Christian Internationalism an adventure, exciting, uncertain, tremendous, hard, but hopeful. It is just the sort of enterprise to win and hold the allegiance of all true liberals or progressives, all "forward-looking folk," all real Christians.

When we remind ourselves of what the tiny handful of early Christians dared dream and predict for their movement, as they set it forth in the Book of Revelation, how that little, weak, despised set of idealists looked forward confidently to the victory of their cause over the empire and the religion of their day, when we remember how much of that dream has come true, we are ashamed to doubt that the Christianity of to-day is able to dominate and transform international relations, to bring the Kingdom of God to authority in the affairs of nations and governments.

II. There are certain powerful reactions which we cannot escape, if we face these facts and conclusions, reflexes on our normal life in other realms than the political.

1. The ideals and policies of Christian Internationalism react powerfully on the church and its life. For the moment the church takes up the cause of uniting the nations, it is faced with the duty and necessity of bringing unity and order into its own life, of uniting the denominations.

If the church attempts to teach or preach the need of international order, of the subordinating of irresponsible nationalism to the general welfare of humanity, the nations can retort in the words of Paul, "Thou therefore that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?" If we cannot

get Presbyterians, and Methodists, and Baptists, and Episcopalians, together, how can we expect great states to form federative unions, or correlate their political functions? The church must either be silent on this great matter, the greatest moral question of the age, or must set her own house in order, so that she can speak peace to the nations in the name of God with a united voice.

Moreover the church must see that the Christian religion has to do with far more than the conduct and faith of the individual; that it is profoundly concerned with group morality, with social relationships and duties, that religion is not synonymous with piety, but is a blend of piety and social service.

2. The cause of internationalism reacts powerfully also upon social and political conditions here in America. We cannot speak great words about international justice, and stand for international fair dealing, and then deal unfairly with the foreigner within our own bounds. It will be a disgrace if we send some hundreds of thousands of negroes to help "make the world safe for democracy," and then let them come home to find themselves the victims of the same sort of race discrimination that has been practiced toward them in the past in this country. We cannot talk largely of "brotherhood," and not desire to play the square

and brotherly part toward China and Japan and all the nations with which our relations are delicate and have been questionable. We cannot avoid an uneasy conscience as we reflect that the men who have misled and are misleading Russia got their notions of democracy from their life here in America. There must be changes here, or we cannot without shame stand positively for a world-organization that shall be fair and just.

3. Internationalism has its reflex influence also, and a powerful one, upon industrial and commercial affairs here in our country. It is not enough to fight Germany; we must fight that for which Germany stands. Our casualty lists, long as they are growing, are not yet comparable with those resulting from the processes of industry, in which some 500,000 persons a year are killed or maimed. Why should not the one horror move us as profoundly as the other? Can we fight against autocracy in Prussia, and leave it dominant and protected in American business and industry? Can we fight to extend democracy, and not see that it is extended to the processes of industrial life? Can we outlaw selfish aggression as practiced by Germany, and leave it unmolested when it controls corporations, or unions, or other social groups? Can we abhor "ruthlessness" in warfare, and leave it to work its will in the competitive strug-

gles of our commercial life? We shall learn that it costs a great deal to adopt a high and Christian ideal for the world. We must be prepared to bring all our processes of national life under the power of that ideal, or be condemned as hypocrites.

4. The most powerful and cutting reaction is that upon our personal life. For no one can become a Christian Internationalist, and not be instantly and forcefully challenged to say whether he will be a Christian in reality throughout the range of his personal conduct.

In a sense Germany has done us a service, though a terrible and shameful one. Germany has shown us, by an extreme and naked forthsetting, the repulsiveness and heathenishness of a way of life which we had never quite let go, a way of life with which we Christians made all sorts of compromises. It is time Christians were seeing that they must be whole Christians or none. We cannot serve God and mammon. We cannot go on "limping between two sides." If Christ be the Master, we must follow Him, clear through, from end to end, from side to side, from top to bottom, of life. Too long we have been content to define Christian faith in terms of profession, creed, opinion. Faith, in the Bible, and in real Christian experience, always means commitment,

loyalty. No amount of theological soundness, or mystic saintliness, can ever make up for a lack of plain, downright loyalty to the ideals and words and things of Jesus Christ. There is a sharp sting in the quiet saying of Tolstoi: "Christians do not think Jesus meant what He said!" We must crown Him Lord of all, or send Him away.

III. What duties face us therefore, in our relation, as Christians, to the cause of a true Christian Internationalism?

The first duty is to think about that cause, to think straight and hard, and always in the light of Christ's Spirit and ideals; to study the matter, to become increasingly intelligent about it, realizing its necessity, understanding its program, facing its problems, sharing its hopes.

The soldiers have been doing their part, the greatest, the most indispensable part. You must help think out that future for which they have been fighting in order to give it a chance to live and grow fair.

The crisis in the campaign for internationalism will come when the proposal for the establishment of an international order comes before the American Senate in the form of some concrete treaty or peace settlement. We shall fail at that critical point, unless there is at that time in this country a large body of intelligent, convinced, popular sen-

timent, able to demand that America shall play her full and leading and disinterested part in the proposed League of Nations for justice and peace.

A second duty, closely akin to the first, is the duty of getting into intimate relation with those societies and organizations which are working for a sound Christian Internationalism; such as the League to Enforce Peace, the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, and the National Committee on the Churches and the Moral Aims of the War. Help to set clearly before all our people what it is for which America is really fighting, how intimately the organization of a League of Nations is bound in with the meaning of the war itself. Do all in your power to open churches and clubs and all sorts of social groups to discussions and presentations of this cause of Christian Internationalism.

But the chief duty, the first, the last, the basic one, is that each of us make his own solemn and determined choice, in the sight of God, and in the strength of Christ, to be loyal through and through; loyal to our nation, and to our government, and to our cause; and loyal to this great end of Christian Internationalism so intimately connected with all the faiths that come to us from the past, and with all the hopes that lie before humanity. It is the supreme epoch in human history for

Christians to be Christian, and to determine that the world's life shall be brought into obedience to the will of God in Christ.

No words can better set forth the spirit in which we should face the world of our day, its immense demands, its sore needs, its vast responsibilities and opportunities, than words such as those with which Lincoln closed his second Inaugural Address:

“With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive onward to finish the work in which we are engaged, to do all that may achieve a just and lasting peace among all nations.”

THE END

THE following pages contain advertisements of a few of the
Macmillan books on kindred subjects.

RECENT RELIGIOUS HAND BOOKS

Each Sixty Cents

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CRUSADE

By LYMAN ABBOTT

Written by one who has an exultant faith that never in the history of the past has there been so splendid a demonstration of the extent and power of the Christ spirit as to-day.

THE WAY TO LIFE

By HENRY CHURCHILL KING

A discussion of the Sermon on the Mount, similar to that in Dr. King's former book *The Ethics of Jesus*. Besides rewriting them, he has added material on the war and the teachings of Jesus.

IT'S ALL IN THE DAY'S WORK

By HENRY CHURCHILL KING

"Good bracing council . . . a book for all who wish to acquit themselves well in the battle of life."—*The Dial*.

THE WAR AND THE BIBLE

By H. D. ENELOW

Contents:—The Spiritual Problems of the War; The Attitude of the Bible Toward War; The Ethics of War in the Bible; Some Great Wars of the Bible; Heroes of War in the Bible; The War Poetry of the Bible; War Prayers in the Bible; Parallels to the Present War in the Bible; The Ideal of Peace in the Bible.

ARE YOU HUMAN?

By WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE

"Like a stinging fresh breeze with the very salt of life and vigor. . . . Every man ought to get and digest this book."—*Pacific Churchman*.

THE BEST MAN I KNOW

By WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE

"All the virtues and the graces that make for fine quality of life are included. They are presented with a vigor that is like the sting of salt winds, bracing and wholesome,"—*Christian Register*.

THE CHURCH AND THE MAN

By DONALD HANKEY

"Filled with the wise sincerity of a religious conviction that cares little for creed and miracle, that finds the whole *vade mecum* of life in the simple facts of Christ's active work among men,"—*Boston Transcript*.

THE CHRISTIAN MAN, THE CHURCH AND THE WAR

By ROBERT E. SPEER

Dr. Speer here discusses the essentials of a problem which has exercised Christian men since the beginning of the war. He deals with it sanely and in a manner that will be considered distinctly helpful.

NEW HORIZON OF STATE AND CHURCH

By W. H. P. FAUNCE

"Broad, profound scholarship, close relationship with progressive sentiment all over the land, and unusual powers of keen analysis and graphic statement are forceful elements in *The New Horizon of State and Church*."—*Philadelphia North American*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

WORKS OF THE LATE
DR. WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

A Theology of the Social Gospel

Cloth, 12°, \$1.50

"It is a book which cannot be dismissed either by the orthodox preacher or the socialist leader. Its pages reflect the candid thinker and a free mind, and must be reckoned with by the believers in the church and the ones who still believe that the pulpit can be made a freer platform than any other instituted rostrum from which the public is to be instructed. The press is far more muzzled than the pulpit that is occupied by a growing number of the pupils of Professor Rauschenbusch."—*Unity*.

Christianity and the Social Crisis

BY WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

Cloth, 12°, \$1.50

"It is enough to feel that the book was bravely written to free an honest man's heart; that conscientious scholarship, hard thinking, and the determination to tell the truth as he sees it, have wrought it out and enriched it; that it is written in a clear, incisive style, and that there is a noble end in view. . . . It is a book to like, to learn from, and though the theme be sad and serious, to be charmed with."—*Joseph O'Connor in The New York Times Review*.

Christianizing the Social Order

BY WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

\$1.50

"Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch's new book, 'Christianizing the Social Order,' is an impressive sequel to his suggestive and stimulating volume, 'Christianity and the Social Crisis,' which marked him as one of the leaders in the comparatively new movement in behalf of a bold stand by the churches for radical social reform. His volume is one of the important sociological books of the year."—*Springfield Republican*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

The Course of Christian History

By W. J. McGLOTHLIN, PH.D., D.D.

Professor of Church History in the Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary.

Cloth, \$2.00

This volume has been written with a full and accurate knowledge of the subject gained from study in European Universities and teaching in one of the leading theological institutions of this country.

While it is thoroughly scientific in spirit and is abreast of the latest developments, the author has at the same time preserved that lucidity and simplicity of statement and style which make the book interesting and readable for the general student.

"The study of the course that has been taken by the Church in its extended life is most interesting and fascinating, when guided by one who is able to speak as a real master. . . . The growth and development of the church from its early days, on through the middle centuries and into modern times, is portrayed in a skillful and authoritative way, and much light is shed on the great controversies and councils, in the development of doctrines, the spread of heresies and the expansion of the life and work of the church."—*Herald and Presbyter*.

"The volume is different from the general run of church histories. . . . It is readable, interesting and informing. The book is intended primarily for college students and is well adapted to this use. . . . The book is also well adapted to the use of Bible classes, mission study classes, etc., and could be used by them to great profit. . . . Dr. McGlothlin has done a splendid piece of work in this volume and made a real contribution to the literature on the history of Christianity. We wish for this book a wide reading."—*Review and Expositor*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

Patriotism and Religion

By DR. SHAILER MATHEWS

Author of "The Social Teachings of Jesus," "The Church and the Changing Order," etc.

Cloth, 12°, \$1.25

The close relationship between religion and patriotism is Dr. Mathews' theme in this volume. The treatment, while in a broad sense historical, centers about the two types of patriotism as illustrated in Germany and in democratic countries. The religious significance of each patriotism is shown to be something more than a mere accident. The volume is of interest as a study of a phase of social Christianity as well as a frank discussion of the failure of the Christianity of the past to apply the teaching of Jesus to social affairs.


"This distinguished theologian and Christian apostle has performed a noble service in setting forth clearly and convincingly the relationship between patriotism and religion and the duty of the Christian believer in the present world crisis. No namby-pamby sacerdotal pussyfooting is there in his ringing words:

"'Can we then love our enemies? Yes, we can love them, but we cannot like them. . . . Love for enemies does not mean that we should suffer them to do others harm; that we should approve their brutality, condone their atrocities, or submit to their oppression. . . . If they threaten the world with the sword, we shall protect the world with the sword. Love for our enemies is not moral if it deadens our indignation against the crimes they perpetrate. . . . Indignation and loathing are not hatred. Self-protection is not vindictiveness. . . . We shall love our enemies, but we shall not disarm until they are harmless.'

"That we conceive to be a reverent and accurate reflection of the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth."—*New York Tribune*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York



DATE DUE



26
M5

BR 115 .I7 M477 1919

45,006

Merrill, William Pierson,
1867--

Christian internationalism

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library

MAIN
Merrill, Will

BR15.17 M477 1919
Christian internationalism



3 0645 0002 6233 3